DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 755 FL 024 252

AUTHOR Nabors, Leslie K., Ed.
TITLE Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Volume 12, Number 1.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 101p.; For individual papers, see FL 024 253-257.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v12 n1 Spr 1996

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Adult Education; *Applied Linguistics; Class Activities; Classroom Techniques; Contrastive Linguistics; *English (Second Language); Immigrants; Language Research; *Language Tests; *Linguistic Theory; *Parent Empowerment; Parent Participation; Parent Role; Pragmatics; Refugees; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Second Languages; Sociocultural Patterns; Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS Americans (United States); Japanese People; Requests

ABSTRACT

Five papers in diverse areas of linguistics in education are presented. "Second Language Learning through Interaction: Multiple Perspectives" (Teresa Pica) looks at the variety of theoretical approaches to interaction in second language learning, and how an interactionist perspective lends weight to a number of theories. "Acquaintance or Fiancee: Pragmatic Differences in Requests between Japanese and Americans" (Mitsuo Kubota) contrasts culture-based speech styles and strategies for making requests. In "Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion Tests" (Manka Varghese, Kristine Billmyer), the effect of systematic modification to discourse completion tests' situational prompts on learners' response is investigated. "Dictogloss: Is It an Effective Language Learning Task?" (Toshiyo Nabei) examines learners' interaction in one stage of dictogloss testing and how it may affect second language learning. "ESL and Parental Empowerment" (Daryl Gordon) examines the role of language in the acculturation process in immigrant and refugee families and draws implications regarding how the English-as-a-Second-Language class functions to empower parents. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics

University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education

ED 401 755

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donnelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WORKING PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS

Editor-in-Chief	Leslie K. Nabors
Editors	Ricardo Díaz Bruce Evans Mitchell A. Furumoto Holly A. Monheimer
Faculty Advisor	Joel Hardman

Language in Education Division
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania

Division Faculty	Teresa Pica, Chair Morton Botel Rebecca Freeman Vivian Gadsden Nancy Hornberger Susan Lytle Joel Hardman Julian Linnell
Division Programs	TESOL Educational Linguistics Reading/Writing/Literacy Intercultural Communication

Volume 12, Number 1 **Spring, 1996**

WORKING PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS

Contents

Second Language Learning Through Interaction: Multiple Perspectives
Teresa Pica **1**

Acquaintance or Fiancee: Pragmatic Differences in Requests between Japanese and Americans
Mitsuo Kubota **23**

Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion Tests
Manka Varghese & Kristine Billmyer **39**

Dictogloss: Is It An Effective Language Learning Task?
Toshiyo Nabei **59**

ESL and Parental Empowerment
Daryl Gordon **75**

Volume 12, Number 1
Spring, 1996

We are pleased to bring you the latest issue of Working Papers in Educational Linguistics. In this issue you will find a collection of articles addressing a wide range of issues in this field; as always, we try to bring you a balanced mix from the many submissions we receive. The outstanding work of the students, faculty, and other people associated with the Language in Education Division at Penn's Graduate School of Education seeks to enlighten language educators and researchers with studies on currently used methodologies and on those which might not be quite ready for implementation.

In the lead article, Teresa Pica discusses how the research focused on language learning through interaction can be examined from multiple perspectives.

Mitsuo Kubota's article considers differences in speech styles and strategies for making requests between Japanese and Americans.

Manka Varghese & Kristine Billmyer examine the internal structure of Discourse Completion Tests and investigate the effect of systematic modification to the DCT situational prompt on subject response.

Toshiyo Nabei's article investigates learners' interaction on dictogloss tasks to see how it might facilitate L2 learning.

Daryl Gordon examines the role of language in the acculturation process on immigrant and refugee families and draws implications regarding how the ESL class functions to empower parents.

In addition to our advisor, Joel Hardman, we gratefully acknowledge the following individuals whose help and cooperation made this publication possible: the authors, Dean Susan Furman, Keith Watanabe, Lorraine Hightower, Frank Kodman, and William Brickman.

We encourage our readers across the world to become producers of material that is serious enough to be published to our interest community and to submit it to our publication or similiar ones at other universities. Ultimately, the journal exchanges we have established provide a wide audience for the advances in educational linguistics.

the editors

Second Language Learning Through Interaction: Multiple Perspectives

Teresa Pica

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Since its inception, the field of second language acquisition (SLA) has been both theory-less and theory-laden. It has been theory-less in that, as most major textbooks remind us, there has yet to emerge a single, coherent theory that can describe, explain, and predict second language learning. Yet it is theory-laden in that there are at least forty claims, arguments, theories, and perspectives that attempt to describe and explain the learning process and predict its outcomes (see Larsen-Freeman & Long 1992: 227). It is within this context that an interactionist perspective on language learning has thrived. As a perspective on language learning, it holds none of the predictive weight of an individual theory. Instead, it lends its own weight to any number of theories.

In an article in one of our foundational journals, *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, Vivian Cook showed how an interactionist perspective could be applied to the three major theories of the time: Krashen's Monitor Theory, Schumann's Acculturation Theory, and Hatch's Conversational Theory (see Cook 1978). In that article, Cook discussed the ways in which each theory attributes the contributions of the learner and the learner's linguistic environment to the learning process. He also reminded us of an already established interactionist tradition in the field of child language learning in which, for example, even the differing theories of Vygotsky and Piaget could also be viewed as interactionist within each perspective.

Over the years, the interactionist perspective has found its strongest identity through a line of research referred to in this paper and elsewhere, as "language learning through interaction." The emphasis in this work has been on the social aspects of interaction, with interaction viewed as the context and process through which language can be learned. Evelyn Hatch, in what most researchers might consider the seminal work in this area, showed us how it is through social interaction with their interlocutors that learners can process an L2 message as input for learning (see Hatch 1978). Long (1983 et passim) added that this input was made particularly comprehensible and processible during a type of interaction known as negotia-

tion. This interaction occurred when the flow of learner's interaction with interlocutors was restructured and modified by requests and responses regarding message comprehensibility.

The cognitive dimensions of the learning process have generally been acknowledged in work on "language learning through interaction," but their role and contributions to L2 learning have been implicit. This is largely due to the fact that process constructs such as "creative construction," "hypothesis testing," indeed, the construct "acquisition," though widely used throughout SLA literature, were not sufficiently described or operationalized for empirical scrutiny.

Over the years, we have come to know much more about SLA. Some of the very factors that were deemed intrusive to the learning process, such as the learner's attention or the learner's use of time, are now seen as crucial to certain aspects of the process. Thus, through the work of Hulstijn (1994) and Schmidt (Schmidt & Frota 1986; Schmidt 1990, 1994), we see that attention matters, and it matters a great deal to the learning process. We see that the dimension of time is a factor in L2 learning, in the immediate term, as well as in the long haul. Studies as different as those of Crookes (1989) and Robinson (1995) on the relationship between planning time and production, by Kelch (1985) on the role of speech rate and input processing, and by Lightbown, Spada, White, and colleagues (see, for example, Lightbown & Spada 1990; White 1991; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta 1992) on retention of learning over time, have certainly brought this fact to light. Of course, there has been more research, more thinking and theorizing, more sharing of findings and ideas in books, journals, and conferences devoted to SLA as a field in its own right. All of this has been of great interest and assistance to work on interaction and has contributed enormously to the field of SLA. What it has done is to open up a number of new perspectives through which the theme of "language learning through interaction" might be viewed.

This article, therefore, will discuss ways in which "language learning through interaction" can be viewed within several of these perspectives that are now available. As such, "language learning through interaction" might be viewed as the interaction of several learner needs —the need to understand an L2 and to express it across modality with accuracy and appropriateness. This article will also discuss "language learning through interaction" as the interaction of learning processes. As such, this would include both the interaction among the cognitive, psycholinguistic, and social processes of language learning as well as the interaction of various processes within them. Finally, this article will describe "language learning through interaction" as the interaction of the learner with native-speaking interlocutors as well as with other learners, both in general and in more specific terms.

Learner's Needs

Current theoretical literature and research on SLA reflects quite a few learner needs with respect to what learners need to be able to do in an L2 and what they need in order to be able to accomplish this. The field has moved beyond the point where comprehensible input is seen as sufficient for L2 learning. So, what do learners need to be able to do? As noted above, they need to understand a language and to express it across modality, with accuracy, and appropriateness, in context. Second, they need to access grammatical categories represented through constructs, such as noun or verb, and to access grammatical functions, such as subject and object. To do all of this, and probably much more, learners need more than comprehensible input. They need, for want of a better term, data — data on L2 form and its relationship to function and meaning. Some of the data is readily available or transparent to learners in messages whose meaning they can understand, so learners still do need to comprehend input.

Yet there are also L2 forms whose relationship with meaning is difficult to access in the L2. These forms may carry little semantic weight or have little perceptual salience, or the form-meaning relationship may be difficult to grasp. Thus, for example, learners are often able to infer the relationship between the English plural *-s* morpheme and its function in context, but they struggle with the English article *a* in all its functional complexity (see Pica 1983 and Harley 1993). Learners also need data as they construct or set their interlanguage. They need to know how their interlanguage differs from the L2. It might be said that they need to know what is ungrammatical, but since interlanguage is systematic and, therefore, grammatical in its own way, one might simply say that learners need to know what in their interlanguage is inconsistent with the L2. Finally, learners need to have data on the potential of their interlanguage for expressing relationships of form and meaning as well as the extent to which they can modify and restructure their interlanguage toward L2 morphosyntax.

The question remains, how learners can meet their data needs. A number of learning processes have been identified. Interestingly for the field of SLA, the factor of attention in L2 learning, previously viewed as controversial at best, and often discounted, has come to be seen as fundamental. As reflected in current literature, attention involves the interaction between two aspects of language learning: the learner's attention to L2 form and meaning as well as attention to the L2 learning experience itself. With respect to the learner's attention, a number of constructs are prominent within the field. These include: consciousness raising (Rutherford & Sharwood Smith 1985), noticing (Gass 1988; Schmidt 1990, 1994), and focus on form (Doughty 1991: Long 1991b, 1995). With respect to the L2 learning experience itself, processes include: awareness of a need to learn (Gass & Selinker 1994) and motivation (Crookes & Schmidt 1991). The latter is seen increas-

ingly in both its cognitive and social dimensions, as exhibited through attention, persistence, and active involvement in learning activities.

A number of additional processes follow from attention. As reflected in the discussion below, some have been operationalized with greater details than others. Some have been subjected to a considerable amount of research, and some appear to be more relevant to the learner's data needs than others are. These processes and their contributions to L2 learning first include comprehension of meaning. This process has long been viewed as a required *condition* for L2 learning (Long 1983, 1985; Krashen 1981, 1983), which functions to free the learner's attention to focus on form (Krashen 1981, 1983). However, a number of research findings contest this perspective on comprehension. Work by van Patten (1983), for example, has shown that simultaneous attention to form and meaning is difficult. Furthermore, recent research has revealed how comprehension actually draws the learner's attention to focus on form, as learners attempt to comprehend the meaning of messages encoded with: relative clauses (Doughty 1991), locatives (Loschky 1994), and pre/post modifiers (Pica 1994).

Another process of note, but one about which less is known, is the learner's analysis of all this data into units of the L2 with reordering and rearrangement as actual L2 constituents (Klein 1986). This is constrained by complexity of processing required for the L2 to serve as data for stage development (Meisel, Clashen, & Pienemann 1981; Pienemann 1989). Yet another process is the learners' comparison of their interlanguage with the second language. This process facilitates "noticing the gap" between L2 input and interlanguage production (Schmidt & Frota 1986). It also facilitates the learner's awareness of rule application and misapplication (Tomassello & Herron 1988, 1989). It is believed to be especially helpful in giving learners access to difficult data as well as access to their own interlanguage as data for learning.

Additional processes that lean toward the production and access needs of learners include their planning and production of meaningful messages. Message planning has been shown to draw attention to preciseness of form needed for message meaning for articles (Crookes 1989) and for the past regular (Ellis 1987) and is very much driven by topic familiarity and context. What this has shown is that the less familiar context available to the learner's interaction, the more the learner must aim toward accurate and often complex coding of the message. In short, the less of context there is, the more linguistic coding is required (Chaudron & Parker 1990; Robinson 1995). This is also why, as will be discussed below, as input is made comprehensible to learners, and as learners attempt to modify their own output toward comprehensibility, L2 coding becomes more elaborated, not simplified as was previously thought.

Another process is message production. This draws the learner's attention to the clarity and complexity of form needed for message meaning during production of modified output (Linnell 1995; Pica et al. 1989, 1991;

Pica 1994, in press; Pica et al. 1995; Swain & Lapkin 1994). Other processes include the internalization, storage, restructuring, and retrieval of interlanguage. Compared to other processes involved in L2 learning, less is known about how these function. However, there is considerable agreement that L2 learning is largely a long-term process; thus, any change that occurs in the learner's interlanguage in a given moment of social interlanguage is often not sustained over time (see Carroll & Swain 1993; Harley 1989; White 1991).

Social Processes of L2 Learning

A great deal has been written about the social processes of L2 learning. These include interaction modified by negotiation and its close cousin, collaborative dialogue, as well as instructional intervention, instructional discourse, and garden path interaction, which itself is a variant on instructional interaction.

Negotiation

Interaction modified by negotiation, or negotiation for meaning, as it is often called, has been described in the SLA literature on many occasions. Contributions from some of the many researchers who have contributed studies in this area are found in the edited volume by Day (1986). Additional research is found in Doughty (1991); Gass & Varonis (1985a, 1986, 1989, 1994); Hatch (1978); Holliday (1991); Linnell (1995); Long (1980, 1983, 1995); Mackey (1995); Oliver (1995); Pica (1992, 1994); Pica et al. (1989, 1991, 1995); Varonis & Gass (1985a, b). Interaction modified by negotiation consists of messages about comprehensibility — audibility, accuracy, relevance, as well as lexical and phrasal meanings. Negotiation can occur through open questions or modifications of previous utterances (e.g. repetition, extraction, or segmentation); these appear in italics in the excerpts shown throughout this article. Another part of negotiation are responses to signals. These are generally encoded with the same types of modifications as signals are — repetition, extraction, segmentation, and other modifications of previous utterances, as well as forms of *yes* and *no*. Responses are shown in bold in the excerpts.

Research has revealed a number of important contributions of negotiation to L2 learning. First, negotiation assists comprehension. The signals and responses of negotiation make message meaning comprehensible to participating learners (see Pica, Young, & Doughty 1987; Doughty 1991), and to learners who simply observe others negotiate (Pica 1991; Mackey 1995). As seen from excerpts 1-3, negotiation also brings salience to form-meaning relationships and in this way, also addresses the analytical process of segmenting message data into L2 units. Thus, for example, research by Pica (1994) found that 18% of native speaker and 12% of learner signal utterances as well as 24% of native speaker and 21% of learner response utterances were modified for both lexis and structure. Supportive results

were also shown in Doughty (1991) and Mackey (1995). Note that in excerpt 1, the NS responds to the learner's signal both by defining *chimney* and by moving it from object of the preposition *with* to subject of the response utterance *chimney is where the smoke comes out of*. This contribution of negotiation is also shown in the more extended negotiation of excerpt 2, in which the NS shows the learner the sound and meaning differences between *fire* and *fall*, the structural possibilities of the phrasal verb *fall over* and the particle verb *knock over*.

Excerpt 1:

Hiro:	Jack:
	ok with a big chimney
what is chimney?	**chimney is where the smoke comes out of**

(Pica 1993)

Excerpt 2:

Seiji:	Paul:
...and er fire	yeah
fire each other	**and no- fire- no-**
	fall over each other
fall fall	**fall over each other**
	you know what I mean?
	they knock each other -
fall	**yeah**
fall each other ok	
fall is a held each other held?	**yeah yeah they fall over each other they knock each other over they-**
sorry	**they're knocked down**
	but that- but the fire knocks them down er- they fall down
fall down	**yeah over each other or something**
fall	**yes**
fall down each other	**yeah**

(Pica et al. 1996)

The NS's responses to the learner also display differences in transitivity between *fall over* and *knock over*, although, as noted earlier, this sort of momentary input was to have no apparent impact on the learner's production. In fact, the NS seems to make the impact a little worse by responding only to the meaning of the learner's message rather than to its form. Toward the end of the excerpt, Seichi asks Paul about *fall down each other* and Paul says, *yeah—yes* for meaning, but not *yes* for form. Unfortunately, there is really nothing inherent in this negotiation that could have informed Seichi of this distinction.

As seen in excerpt 3, even learners can assist each other through negotiation in ways that are as effective as, and, in some instances, surpass the NS as an interlocutor but which, in other ways, are much less effective. This situation will be described below. For now, however, what should be noted is that in response to a signal from Taro about *two stairs*, Ichi brought out the semantic and morphosyntactic relationships among *step*, *steps*, and *stairs*. This provided informative data about the L2, though not in the standard variety of English to which Taro presumably wants access.

Excerpt 3:

Taro	Ichi
	...and the door is located in the center of the house and has two stairs
has two stairs	**ah I mean two steps of stairs actually one stair**
oh I got it	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Negotiation also provides learners with feedback, most notably, according to Long, on vocabulary, morphology, L2-specific syntax, and L1-L2 contrasts (see Long, in press). Using Long's framework (1995), as it builds on Pinker (1989), we can say that negotiation signals provide feedback that is made usable and useful. This is accomplished in several ways, including target-like models, recasts, and reduced repetitions. Target-like models of learner utterances facilitate the learner's production of modified output, at least in the short run. This can be seen in excerpts 4-7.

Excerpt 4:

Kata	Allan
he forgot to switch on	*to switch off*
he forgot to switch off	**right**
and so make fire	*and it made a fire*
yeah, yeah	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Excerpt 5:

Kato	Mack
...gasgon	*a what? say that again*
gasgon gasgon	*the gas*
the gas	*on the stove*
stove er the stove	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Excerpt 6:

Seiji	Paul
	she turns the gas on to the stove or something like that
she turn on er gas stove	**yeah the gas to the stove**
she she er then phone phone is ringing	*ah ah then she she heard the phone ringing*
yes she heard heard phone ringing ok	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Excerpt 7:

Taro	Ichi
its wall is complete white	*completely white?*
yeah completely white	
yeah completely white	
it looks not wood	
it looks concrete	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

In Excerpt 4, for example, Kata was able to correct her *switch on* to *switch of*. In Excerpt 5, Kato's *gasgon* became *the gas*, with help from Mack. In Excerpt 6, Seiji switched to the past tense following Paul's signal, and in 7, Taro was able to modify *complete white* to *completely white*, based on Ichi's negotiation signal (Gass & Varonis 1994; Pica et al. 1995; Linnell 1995).

Negotiation also supplies feedback through recasts. These are immediate responses that reformulate, expand, and are semantically contingent to incorrect learner utterances. They seem to work most effectively if there is one learner error per recast. In negotiation, recasts appear primarily in signals to learner utterances, but they also occur in other utterance types in other forms of discourse. This fact was recently seen in the recent dissertation research by Oliver (1995) at Western Australia (see also Long, in press; Mackey 1995; Philip & Mackey 1995). Excerpt 8 shows a good example of a recast. Kata tells Allan *I don't have a telephones picture* and Allan signals with *you don't have a picture of a telephone?*

Excerpt 8:

Kata	Allan
	and right next to her a phone rings?
forring?	a phone? telephone? is there a telephone next to her?
yeah...I don't have a telephones picture	*you don't have a picture of a telephone?*
yes, I have another picture...	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Other feedback can take the form of reduced repetitions of learner error, with emphasis on the error itself (Chaudron 1977). This can be seen again in Excerpts 4, 6, and 7. These forms of feedback can also be found in discourse outside of negotiation. In spite of helpful data on L2 and interlanguage that can come through negotiation, it is important to point out — as is evident from the excerpts — that there is really nothing explicit in a negotiation signal that tells learners whether the signal is about code, meaning, grammatical accuracy, or social appropriateness. This is why the data that negotiation provides for L2 learning may not be sufficient to meet learners' needs. This is also why other kinds of intervention may be required, especially for the kinds of inaccessible data noted above.

In addition to addressing learners' needs for input and feedback, negotiation provides a context for their production of modified output, particularly when signals are clarification requests and open questions rather than confirmation checks or segments (see Pica et al. 1989, 1991, 1995; Linnell 1995). This can be seen throughout the excerpts, but especially in excepts 9-13 where signals such as *you have what?* in 9, *sorry?* in 10, *what* in 11 and 13, and *I am confused I don't get it* in 12, draw forth learner responses of lexical as well as morphosyntactic modification to their messages.

Excerpt 9:

Kata	Allan
round the house we have glass	*you have what?*
uh grass, plants and grass	

(Pica 1992a)

Excerpt 10:

Learner	Learner
there's a three — tree	*a tree?*
yes a tree on the right a small tree	*a very little tree?*
sorry?	*it's a little little tree? it's a big tree?*
a little not little little but little	yeah ok

(Assis 1995: 29)

Excerpt 11:

Taro	Ichi
	ah where is one door?
what?	**where is the door?**

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Negotiation has also been shown to bring about morphosyntactic complexity of NS input (Pica, Young, & Doughty 1987) and learner output (Pica et al. 1989; Linnell 1995). This latter area can also be a site for message

modification toward syntacticization. Here, learners respond to the signals by modifying messages that had been organized pragmatically, (according to the guidelines of Givon 1979, 1985; Meisel 1987; Linnell 1995), through topic-comment structures, juxtaposition of elements, minimal morphosyntax, and with dependence for comprehensibility on shared situational context. The learners in excerpts 12 and 13 show some evidence of syntacticization in their responses, through their manipulation of the syntax of their initial utterances, with incorporation of additional, contextual information through noun referents, indirect objects, and sentence connectors.

Excerpt 12:

Learner	NS Researcher
they not find the dragon in the cave	*I am confused, I don't get it*
they find not the dragon in the cave	*I am confused. I don't get it*
the dragon hide in the cave and the knights find not it	ok

(Linnell 1995: 266)

Excerpt 13:

Learner	NS Researcher
he said that 'we are ridding the sleigh	*what?*
his friend told the bird to we are rodeing	

(Linnell 1995: 269)

In spite of the evidence that negotiation serves as a social process that interacts with cognitive and psycholinguistic processes of L2 learning, and that addresses interlanguage change, learners have been observed to negotiate more frequently over lexis than over morphosyntax. For example, learners and interlocutors give more attention to the physical features and attributes of the people and objects in their discourse than to the time and activities in which they engage (see Pica 1994; Pica et al. 1995). Although negotiation has been observed over grammatical morphology, this has not been shown in impressive amounts (Pica 1994). In light of these production-related contributions of negotiation, and the input feedback contributions discussed above, it would appear that as a social process, we see that negotiation for meaning can contribute to L2 learning, but that additional contributions are needed to support the psycholinguistic process of L2 learning.

Collaborative dialogue

Another social process of L2 learning is collaborative dialogue. As Swain, Ellis, and Lantolf have shown, collaboration can occur without the kinds of communication breakdowns and repairs that characterize negotiation (see Ellis 1985; Swain 1994; Alijaafreh & Lantolf 1994). Thus, collaboration

provides a basis for scaffolding, completion, and production of modified output (Ellis 1985), particularly in learner-to-learner interaction (Pica et al. 1995; Swain 1994). These processes are illustrated in excerpt 14, in which Mitsuo assisted Katamachi with a form of *boil* that was needed to complete his utterance.

Excerpt 14:

Katamachi	Mitsuo
hm-mm boiled the water my picture is...	*boilding?*
boilding boild boilding	
I don't know how to do .	
I mean there is a water in the cup. how do	
you make a sentence there is a cup...	there's a cup of water
cup of water? then	then cup of water

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Collaborative discourse appears to have much to offer language learners. As yet unknown, however, is whether these features may also be subject to the same signal-response constraints as are found in research on negotiation. Further research on this social process of L2 learning is clearly needed.

Instruction

A more direct way for learners to obtain difficult-to-access data is through instructional intervention, often of a structured and explicit nature. Research has begun to show that meaningful classroom interaction through content-based instruction, while important to L2 learning success, may not always provide a sufficient source of data to meet the learner's needs. Studies of French immersion programs in Canada have identified a good deal of success among students in L1 retention and maintenance. In addition, their level of L2 achievement has been found to be superior to that found in more traditional, foreign language classrooms (see, e.g., Genesee 1987, Snow 1991 for reviews). These, and other studies, however, also report incomplete L2 learning amidst this success — with better comprehension than production, and with linguistic accuracy lower than communicative fluency, as well as inaccuracy with complex clause structures, verb tense and aspect forms and sociolinguistic rules (Lightbown & Spada 1990: White 1991: White, Spada, Lightbown & Ranta 1991). These findings suggest that despite the success of immersion programs with respect to L1 retention and overall achievement, learners may need more than content based instruction can offer them.

One possibility for addressing this need would be instructional intervention that would give learners an opportunity to access L2 data that goes beyond the communication of meaning. As currently operationalized, such instructional intervention includes: metalinguistic information, highlighting of form, and /or corrective feedback.(Lightbown & Spada 1992) and

other forms of enhanced input (Sharwood Smith 1991) designed to focus attention to form in context of communication (Lightbown 1992). A number of studies have shown that these instructed features facilitated learning for: *-ing* and adjective-noun order (Lightbown & Spada 1990); adverb placement (White 1991); dative alternation (Carroll & Swain 1993); conditional (Day & Shapson 1991); questions (White, Spada, Lightbown & Ranta 1990); passé composé vs. imparfait (Harley 1989); and overall grammar (Montgomery & Eisenstein 1986; Spada 1987). In many cases, learners retained the instructed item after their instructional period was over.

Studies that focused on specific features of instruction have revealed significant results in several areas. Thus, research has shown that instruction to attend to form facilitated learning of word order (Hulstijn & Hulstijn 1984) and overall grammar (Spada 1987) for L2 learners. It has also been found that message encoding in L2 forms and structures for which the learner was developmentally ready facilitated the learning of word order and constituent movement (Ellis 1989, Pienemann 1984, 1988); as well as question formation (Mackey 1995). Furthermore, message encoding in L2 structures marked hierarchically, in this case through the relative clause accessibility hierarchy, facilitated the learning and generalizability of relative clauses formation throughout the hierarchy (Doughty 1991; Eckman et al. 1988; Gass 1982). So instruction is making a difference, as Long told us that it would, and instructional interaction is what seems to be quite effective in these cases.

A variation on instructional intervention is garden path interaction, in which learners are given instruction on the rules for production of a regular form which misleads them to overgeneralize the rule to a context where they should use an irregular form. For example, learners might say *drinked* after having been instructed on the *past regular*. This error would provide a basis for the teacher to introduce learners to the *past irregular*. Garden path interaction appears to help learners make cognitive comparisons between their interlanguage and the L2 and to heighten their awareness of rules, regularities, and exceptions that may be difficult to access. In their research, Tomassello and Herron (1988, 1989) have shown that learners who are led down the garden path to first misgeneralize the rules for regular forms and who then are taught exceptions were better able to internalize these irregular forms than those learners who were taught the rules and patterns at the same time.

As was evident throughout the excerpts above, both NS and learner interlocutors can contribute to the cognitive and social processes of L2 learning, and thereby supply data for L2 learning. Their common, as well as unique, contributions are as follows: First, learners are given more modified L2 data from native speakers than from other learners. Thus, in Pica et al. (1989), Pica (1992, 1994), and Pica et al. (1995), it was found that, when engaged in communication tasks, NSs responded to learner signals about utterances that were difficult to understand by modifying those initial ut-

terances 73 percent of the time. Learners, on the other hand, responded to NS signals with only 54 percent modification. This pattern also held for learner responses to other learners, with 51 percent modification observed in learner to learner discourse. NSs seem to modify their prior utterances in response to learner signals in this way regardless of signal type. However, learners modify prior utterances mainly in response to signals that are open questions or clarification requests. This signal-response pattern was revealed in excerpts 1 and 2. In these sections, NSs modified their initial utterances regardless of learner signal. This pattern is quite different from that revealed in excerpts 15-18. Here, the use of modification in the learner's response appeared to be a function of whether or not the signal was a clarification request or an open question, (see Pica et al. 1989, Pica 1994, Pica et al. 1995). Thus, in excerpt 15 the signal *what?* drew a modified response from the learner. The same modification occurred with Sato's signal *light? what? excuse me?* to Shiro in excerpt 16.

Excerpt 15

Learner	NS Researcher
they are think about the fun thing so they are change the position each other	*what?*
they change up the position so they think father went to a preschool and son went to the company OK	

(Linnell 1995: 269)

Excerpt 16

Shiro	Sato
and one picture another picture is two one woman one man sitting on the sofa and the man light his cigarette	*light? what? excuse me?*
another picture is sitting on sofa and are sitting on sofa and the man light on his cigarette	

(Linnell 1995: 269)

This was different from the interaction found in excerpt 17. Here, Mike's modified signals of *on the front?* and *in the front of the door? there is a small step, yes.* drew forth only a variant of *yes* from Masa. In excerpt 18, Katamachi's signal, *she has match?* drew forth only *yes?* from Mitsuo.

Excerpt 17

Masa	Mike
I think on the front is a small stone	*on the front?*
yeah oh doors	*in the front of the door?*
yeah	*there is a small step, yes.*
oh yes	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Excerpt 18

Katamachi	Mitsuo
	my picture she has match
she has match?	**yes**
my picture has a - she is try to turn s—	
how do you say on the gas	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Comparing excerpts 1 and 2, with 19 and 20 illustrates how learners are given more directed and diversified L2 data from NSs than from other learners. As shown in excerpts 1 and 2, NS modifications in responses to learner signals are tied to learner signals through segmentation, relocation, and definition of previous utterances about which the learner has signaled. However, as seen in 19 and 20, learner modifications in response to signals are often repetitions of their prior utterances or add new information, relevant to what is being talked about but not directly linked to the signal. Thus, in excerpt 19, Kata supplied information about the *simple* appearance of his house even though Mitsuo's signal about the house was more concerned with its size. In 20, Kata elaborated about the *way* of his house, even though Mitsuo's signal was about the *door and windows* of the house.

Excerpt 19

Kata	Mitsuo
and in the right side of the tree	
I have a house a big house	*right side*
	a big house?
my house have it's a big but er simple	Ok

(Pica, et al. 1996)

Excerpt 20

Kata	Mitsuo
I have a door and two windows like	
a house that everyone draws and	
with a way	*there is a door*
	and two windows?
a door and two windows and a way	
I have a door and a way for people	
who can pass	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

As these excerpts also illustrate, learners are given more diversified L2 data from NSs than from other learners. This probably occurs because the learners have fewer linguistic resources for modification than do the NSs, both in their production of modified output and as providers of modified

input. Although this capacity of the NSs makes them strong providers of input and feedback, it may also limit the learner's communicative needs, as all of the repetitions, segmentations, expansions, and recasts that native speakers make of learner utterances tend to block learner production of output. This is not surprising given that once learners hear a native model, they have nothing else to say in their responses but *yes, that's what I meant to say?* (Oliver 1995, Pica et al. 1989, Pica 1994, Pica et al. 1995), unless, of course, they had been trying to say something else, in which case they might modify their output. The question then remains: what data are learners good at providing?

In general, during negotiation, the modification that learners make in response to learner signals provide two types of data. For the responding learner, there is interlanguage data on that learner's own potential to manipulate and modify current interlanguage, and for the signaling learner, there is input data to serve the other's interlanguage construction and L2 learning. Both of these data can be seen in excerpt 3. This a clear example of the learner's attempt to modify output lexically and morphosyntactically. In so doing, however, Ichi may have provided a context for his own coordination of modified output; however, he did not supply the best model of L2 input for the other learner. Another contribution of learners as interlocutors is found among learner signals to each other. Those signals that are segmentations of prior utterances are generally quite consistent with standard L2 grammar. This can be seen above in excerpts 3, 7,10 and here in 19 and 20. This is good news, as segmentation constitutes the major signal type among the learners thus far in our research. (see Pica 1992, 1994).

Finally, as had been shown in excerpt 14, and as illustrated in excerpt 21 as well, learners are effective in working together through scaffolding and completion to supply each other with words and phrases needed for message meaning. NSs do this too, but they often complete learner messages with a target version or model of what the learner has already said rather than supply new or missing words for them. This can be seen in excerpt 21. Here, Paul recasted Seiji's *she forget she* with *about the stove* but this as the more appropriate *she forgets about the stove.*

Excerpt 21

Seiji	Paul
and er she she talked er on the phone long time	
she she forget er about the the stove	oh *ah she talks er erm after that she forgets about the stove*
she forget she **yes**	

(Pica, et al. 1996)

The comparison of NSs and learners as resources for L2 learning is not a new direction in the study of language learning through interaction. Earlier incarnations include studies on group work vs. teacher-fronted interaction (Pica & Doughty 1985a, b; Doughty & Pica 1986), and negotiation among learners vs. between native speakers and learners (Gass & Varonis 1985b, 1986). However, these studies were conducted within the theoretical contexts of their time, at a time when researchers counted instances of negotiation and drew inferences about language learning from them. More is now known about learners' needs to access the different kinds of data that assist L2 acquisition, and the need to engage in the cognitive and social processes that offer access to such data.

As researchers take account of the multiple kinds of data needed for different aspects of the learning process and of the different psycholinguistic and social processes involved in accessing these data, they are generating an increasing number of studies that relate to the interaction among these processes. A great deal of new research has emerged on "language learning through interaction" with respect to the different cognitive, psycholinguistic, and social processes described in this article. It is well-conceived, well designed research, with considerable application to the classroom.

Researchers are looking at relationships between types of interaction and learner productions therein. They are looking at feedback, other kinds of input to learners, and the impact these have on learners' responses in the short and long term. Throughout, references have been made to some of the young researchers who are conducting work on language learning through interaction, in one or all of the ways I have noted in this article. Among the new names on the research horizon are Julian Linnell for his recent work on interaction and interlanguage syntacticization (Linnell 1995). Also noted are Rhoda Oliver (1995) for her study of children's interaction, the impact of interaction on the availability of feedback, and the effect this feedback had on their production of modified output (Oliver 1995); Alison Mackey for her work on the impact of negotiation on accelerating learners through developmental stages of L2 learning (Mackey 1995); and Anna Assis, and Peter Robinson for their studies on communication tasks and language learning (Assis 1995; Robinson 1995).

These and other junior researchers, along with those who are already highly established, are ushering a new phase of research on language learning through interaction. It is a time when leading researchers such as Gass, Long, Lightbown, and Swain are forging new lines of research on the relationship between feedback and language learning (see Long in press, Lightbown 1994; Swain 1994). Swain has also subjected her own construct of comprehensible output to research on collaborative discourse. (see Swain 1994), and Lightbown has directed a series of experimental studies on classroom interaction and SLA, with collaborators Spada, White, and Ranta (see White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta 1991). The point to be made in closing

is that the field of SLA has come a long way from looking at interaction and L2 learning from the perspective of social interaction alone. Now that many of the more cognitive constructs of L2 learning have been operationalized, they too can be studied within an interactionist perspective and implemented with these social dimensions.

What this all means is that researchers no longer simply study features of social interaction but examine the interactions among these features, as they question how they affect the learning needs and processes of language learners. If there were a time in the past when this line of research seemed to be at standstill, simply counting instances of interaction (see Ellis 1991), that time has passed. With new, operationalized variables and multiple perspectives for examining them, there is much work to be done.

References

Alijaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 465-483.

Assis, A. A. (1995). Peers as a resource for language learning in the foreign language context: Insights from an interaction-based study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 357-386.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors.*Language Learning, 27* (1), 29-46.

Chaudron, C., & Parker, K. (1990). Discourse markedness and structural markedness: The acquisition of English noun phrases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 43-64.

Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 367-83.

Day, R. (Ed.). (1986). *Talking to learn*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (1991). Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: An experimental study. *Language Learning, 41* (1), 25-58.

Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of second language relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13* (4), 431-469.

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). Information gap tasks: An aid to second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 305-325.

Eckman, F., Bell, L., & Nelson, D. (1988). On the generalization of relative clause instruction in the acquisition of English as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 9*, 1-20.

Ellis, R. (1985). Teacher-pupil interaction in second language development. In S. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.),*Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 69-85). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style-shifting in the use of past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9*, 1-20.

Ellis, R. (1989). Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? A study of the classroom acquisition of German word order rules. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition ,11* (3), 305-328.

Ellis, R. (1991). *The interaction hypothesis: A critical evaluation.* Paper presented at the RELC conference, Singapore.

Gass, S. (1982). From theory to practice. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL '81.* (pp.129-139). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Gass, S. (1988). Integrating research areas: A framework for second language studies. *Applied Linguistics, 9,* 198-217.

Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1985a). Task variation and non-native/non-native negotiation of meaning. In S. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1985b). Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second language Acquisition, 7,* 37-58.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1986). Sex differences in NNS/NNS interactions. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1989). Incorporated repairs in NNS discourse. In M. Eisenstein & E. Hatch (Eds.) (1978), *Acquisition of syntax in a second language.* In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning: Issues and approaches.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16,* 283-302.

Genesee, F. (1987). Learning through two languages: *Studies of immersion and bilingual education.* Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Givón, T. (1984). Universals of discourse structure and second language acquisition. In W. Rutherford (Ed.), *Topological universals and second language acquisition.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics, 10,* 331-359.

Hatch, E. (1978). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning* (pp. 34-70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hatch, E. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Holliday, L. (1993). NS syntactic modifications in NS-NNS negotiation as input data for second language acquisition of syntax. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Holliday, L. (1993). *Negotiation as a source of positive data for acquisition of L2 syntax.* Paper presented at the Second Language Research Forum, Pittsburg, PA.

Hulstijn, J. (1989). Implicit and incidental second language learning: Experiments in the processing of natural and partly artificial input. In Dechert & Raupach (Eds.)

Kelch, K. (1985). Modified input as an aid to comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,* 81-89.

Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1983). Newmark's ingnorance hypothesis and current second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 135-156). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Lightbown, P. (1983). Exploring relationships between developmental and instructional sequences in L2 acquisition. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 217-243). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lightbown, P. (1992). Getting quality input in the second/foreign language classroom. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198-197). New York: Heath.

Lightbown, P. (1992). Can they do it themselves? A comprehension-based ESL course for young children. In R. Courchene, J. Glidden, J. St. John, & C. Therien (Eds.), *Comprehension-based second language teaching*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 429-448.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1992). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 429-448.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linnell, J. (1995). Negotiation as an aid to syntacticization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Long, M. (1980). *Input, interaction, and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California.

Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5*, 177-194.

Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. (1990). The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL, 9*, 59-75.

Long, M. (1991a). The least a theory of second language acquisition needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 649-666.

Long, M. (1991b). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. (1995). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition (Vol. 2): Second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.

Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: What's the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 303-324.

Mackey, A. (1994). *Using communicative tasks to target grammatical structures. A handbook of tasks and instructions for their use*. Language Acquisition Research Center, University of Sydney, Australia.

Mackey, A. (1995). Stepping the pace: Input, interaction and second language acquisition. An empirical study of questions in ESL. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sydney.

Meisel, J. (1987). Reference to past events and actions in the development of natural second language acquisition. In Pfaff (Ed.), *First and second language acquisition processes*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Meisel, J. M., Clahsen, H., & Pienemann, M. (1981). On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3*, 109-135.

Montgomery, C., & Eisenstein, M. (1986). Real reality revisited: An experimental communicative course in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 317-333.

Oliver, R. (1994). *Negative feedback in child NS/NNS conversation*. Paper presented at the Second Language Research Forum, McGill University, Montreal, October 1994.

Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS/NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.

Pica, T. (1983). Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning, 33*, 465-497.

Pica, T. (1991). Classroom interaction, participation and comprehension: Redefining relationships. *System, 19*, 437-452.

Pica, T. (1992). The textual outcomes of native speaker-non-native speaker negotiation. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Pica, T. (1993). Communication with second language learners: What does it reveal about the social and linguistic processes of second language acquisition? In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Language, communication, and social meaning*. (pp. 434-464). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pica, T. (1994). Review article: Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44* (3), 1-35

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985a). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*, 233-248.

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985b). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acqusition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pica, T. (In press). Do second language learners need negotiation? *International Review of Applied Linguistics*.

Pica, T, Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 737-758.

Pica, T, Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morganthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 63-90.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berducci, D., & Newman, J. (1991). Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 343-376.

Pica, T, Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1995). What can second language learners learn from each other? Only their researcher knows for sure. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 11* (1), 1-36.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Unpublished raw data.

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6*, 186-214.

Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics, 10*, 52-79.

Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Robinson, P. (1995). Task complexity and second language narrative discourse. *Language Learning, 45* (1), 99-140.

Rutherford, W., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-raising and universal grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.). *Grammar and second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House/Harper and Row.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R.Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 17-46.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 12*, 206-226

Sharwood Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research, 7*, 118-132.

Snow, M. A. (1991). Teaching language through content. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 315-328). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Spada, N. (1987). Relationships between instructional differences and learning outcomes: A process-product study of communicative language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 8* (1), 137-161.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 205-224.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-256). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1994). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cool & B. Scidlhofer (Eds.), *For H. G. Widdowson: Principles and practice in the study of language. A festschrift on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1994). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. Modern Language Centre. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, August 1994.

Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1988). Down the garden path: Inducing and correcting overgeneralization errors in the foreign language classroom. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 9* (3), 237-246.

Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1989). Feedback for language transfer errors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 385-395.

van Patten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 287-301.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985a). Miscommunication in native/non-native conversation. *Language in Society, 14*, 327-343.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985b). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6* (1), 71-90.

White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research, 7*, 133-161.

White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. *Applied Linguistics, 12*, 416-432.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teresa Pica is the Ethel G. Carruth Associate Professor and Chair of the Language in Education Division. She has earned an MA in Speech Pathology from Columbia University Teachers College and a PhD from the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interests social intercation between language learners and native speakers and the role of instruction in the acquisition process in second and foreign language acquisition.

Acquaintance or Fiancee: Pragmatic Differences in Requests between Japanese and Americans

Mitsuo Kubota

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Many researchers have indicated difficulties in acquiring a speech community's rules for appropriate language use. Learners' use of strategies, such as transferring the rules in their native language and overgeneralizing the target language culture, often make acquiring rules problematic. This study provides empirical findings on how the speech style used in making requests differs among native-speakers of Japanese, Americans learners of Japanese and Americans speaking English. Based on the findings, the researcher examines the type of strategies American learners use when they speak Japanese and discusses how these strategies become problematic.

Since Hymes (1972a, b) proposed the concept of communicative competence, many researchers (e.g., Paulston 1974; Canale & Swain 1980) have sought applications of the concept for language teaching. Hymes emphasized acquiring a speech community's rules for appropriate language use in a given social context in addition to developing general linguistic knowledge. Consequently, developing sociolinguistic competence, traditionally not a focus of language teaching, has come to be one of the major emphases in language teaching (Savignon 1983). However, many researchers have reported that even learners at the advanced level have considerable difficulty acquiring these society-specific rules of appropriateness (e.g., Cohen & Olshtain 1981; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz 1990; Eisenstein & Bodman 1986; Billmyer, Jakar, & Lee 1989; Wolfson 1989; Billmyer 1990; Olshtain & Cohen 1991).

Wolfson (1983: 61) and Olshtain and Cohen (1991: 155) stated that each language differs not only in general linguistic areas such as phonology, syntax and lexicon, but also in the rules of speaking and the patterns of interaction which vary from one speech community to another. Language learners are required to be proficient in these community-specific rules in order to communicate appropriately and effectively with people in the target language (Wolfson: 61). Due to the current trend in communicative

language teaching that emphasizes acquiring these rules of speaking, empirically based research has been carried out to meet the needs of material developers and language teachers (Wolfson 1989: 79).

In spite of these researchers' emphasis on sociolinguistic rules for language teaching, as stated above, second language learners often fail to acquire rules of appropriateness. Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990: 56) identified pragmatic transfer as one of the reasons for this failure. Wolfson (1989:141) defined pragmatic transfer as "the use of rules of speaking from one's own native speech community when interacting with members of the host speech community." Second language learners' attempts to translate conventional routines specific to a first language (L1) verbatim into the second language (L2) often result in miscommunication even if the results of their attempts are grammatically correct (Olshtain & Cohen 1991: 155).

Among various types of speech acts, face-threatening acts such as refusals, requests, and disagreements are particularly problematic for a second language learner if speech rules in their first language are employed (Beebe & Takahashi 1989; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz 1990; Fukushima 1990). Brown and Levinson (1978: 65-67) defined face-threatening acts as acts that intrinsically threaten face, the public self-image that a person seeks to preserve. Fukushima conducted a study of requests in English made by Japanese university students. She found that the Japanese subjects failed to employ appropriate formulaic expressions which are considered to be appropriate by native speakers. The problems manifested in the subjects' overuse of *I'm sorry* to soften a request. Second, other expressions used by the subjects tended to be too direct and oftentimes were interpreted as being rude.

In addition to the problems of transferring learners' L1 rules into L2, Beebe and Takahashi (1989) found that second language learners sometimes experienced communication breakdowns due to overgeneralizing stereotypes of the target language culture. The Japanese subjects in their study tended to be too direct because their English teachers overemphasized directness in speaking English.

While observing Japanese learners' sociolinguistic errors, the researcher found that some of the errors were caused by pragmatic transfer and overgeneralization of the target language culture. In this paper, differences in Japanese speech patterns between native Japanese speakers and American learners of Japanese will be examined. Specifically, the following questions will be addressed:

1. When Americans speak Japanese, how does their speech style differ from the style of native Japanese speakers?

2. Does pragmatic transfer exist in the sequence of speech acts, the choice of lexical items, and the content of semantic formulas used in the speech act production of Americans speaking Japanese?

3. Does overgeneralization of stereotypes exist in the speech of Americans speaking Japanese?

Methods

Subjects

The subjects who participated in this study include 5 native Japanese subjects speaking Japanese (JJ), 5 American subjects speaking Japanese (AJ), 5 American subjects speaking English (AE), and the experimenter whose L1 is Japanese. All of the subjects are males in their mid to late 20s. The JJs are students in a business school in the US Their lengths of stay in the US varies between one and three years. Some of them identify themselves as being Americanized, and their status in the Japanese business community is considerably high, so their ways of interacting with people do not necessarily represent a typical Japanese speech norm, particularly in the use of politeness. The AJs are students of the same business school. They are the experimenter's students studying Japanese language and culture. They have previously lived in Japan for one to three years. Their proficiency in Japanese is high based on the Oral Proficiency Interview test administrated by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, with scores ranging from advanced high to superior.[1] They also have knowledge of the sociolinguistic rules of Japanese. The AEs are also students of the same business school. Two of them have visited Japan and the other three have never visited Japan.

Data collection procedure

The data were elicited through role play situations. The experimenter prepared a scenario that included the face-threatening situation of making a request to a supervisor. The content of the request was to ask for an afternoon off. Since the reason for the day off was to go to the airport to pick up his fiancee, it would have been expected to create an awkward situation (see Appendix B). The subjects were asked to play the employee's role approximately three minutes after it was shown to them. All of the role plays were tape-recorded and the portion which dealt with the request were transcribed from the tapes by the experimenter.

To collect the Japanese data the experimenter played the supervisor. In playing that role, the experimenter was consistent in interacting with the subjects. To collect the English data, four native speakers of American English played the supervisor role, and five native speakers of American English played the employees. Although the interactions could not be controlled as well as in the Japanese data, since different people played the supervisor role, overall interactions were quite consistent.

---

[1] According to the ACTFL OPI tester training manual (1989), "the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview is a standardized procedure for the global assessment of functional speaking ability, or oral proficiency." "The Superior level is characterized by the ability to discuss a broad range of topics in depth by supporting opinions and hypothesizing about abstract issues."

Data analyses procedure

The transcribed data (see Appendix A) were analyzed by the following procedure: First, the data from the JJs and AJs were compared in order to identify differences between these two groups' speech styles in the order of speech act production for requests, and the content of semantic formulas used in the speech act production of opening a conversation and making a request. Second, the data from AJs and AEs were compared in order to determine if the identified differences were due to pragmatic transfer from their L1. In addition to the transcribed data, the experimenter conducted follow-up interviews with all of the subjects after the role play in order to uncover what motivated their speech.

Findings

The sequence of speech act production

The speech style of JJs and AJs differed in the order of speech act. Both of the groups started with some opening statements. However, there was a discrepancy in the order of request and reasoning.

As appears in Tables 1 and 2, all AJs explained the situation that made them ask for an afternoon off before making a request. In contrast to AJs, four out of five JJs started with a statement of request, and followed up with explanations. Moreover, three out of the five JJs did not state the reasons for requesting the afternoon off until the supervisor asked.

The discrepancy in the order of the speech acts between JJs and AJs may be due to differences in the business cultures between the two countries. As seen in Tables 2 and 3, Americans followed the same order of speech act regardless of the language they were using. Thus, this difference in the order of speech act production may be interpreted as one of pragmatic transfer from the native language.

When I pointed out this difference in the order of request and reasoning after the role play, one American subject Philip[2] expressed the confusion he

Table 1
Order of speech act production for JJs' requests

	1	2	3
Akira	opening	request	reasons
Tomoo	opening	request	reasons
Masao	opening	reasons	request
Toshio	opening	request	reasons
Yumio	opening	request	reasons

[2] Pseudonyms are used for all subjects. The pseudonyms are as follows: Akira, Tomoo, Masao, Toshio, Yumio for the Japanese subjects, Philip, John, Steve, Jim, David for American subjects speaking Japanese, Mark, Jason, Jeff, Frank, Bill for American subjects speaking English.

Table 2
Order of speech act production for AJs' requests

	1	2	3
Philip	opening	reasons	request
John	opening	reasons	request
Steve	opening	reasons	request
Jim	opening	reasons	request
David	opening	reasons	request

Table 3
Order of speech act production for AEs' requests

	1	2	3
Mark	opening	reasons	request
Jason	opening	reasons	request
Jeff	opening	reasons	request
Frank	opening	reasons	request
Bill	opening	reasons	request

felt which was caused by the difference. When he worked for a bank in Japan, his Japanese colleagues often made requests or refused his invitations without stating any reasons. This made him very uncomfortable because he thought it was necessary to state reasons in these situations based on his cultural norm. Furthermore, since he was not sure if it was culturally appropriate for him to ask the reason, he felt very awkward in these situations (Philip, interview, March 20, 1995).

In contrast to his comments, one of the Japanese subjects Akira stated that Japanese business people are embarrassed to take a day off for a private reason due to the Japanese business society's strong emphasis on devotion to a company. According to Akira, employees in Japan are often expected to prioritize business ahead of private matters. The business community's expectation of Akira's company for employees may have resulted in the subjects' avoiding to state reasons for taking the afternoon off. Moreover, the subjects who did not explain the reasons before the supervisor asked expressed that they were hoping that they would not have to mention the reason (Akira and Toshio, interview, March 20, 1995). One other subject Tomoo commented that if it were a real situation, he would have made some arrangements in order not to take the day off. According Tomoo, it would be inappropriate to even approach the supervisor for the day off for the stated reason (Tomoo, interview, March 20, 1995).

The lexical items used for giving the reason to make the request

Differences in the business community's expectations for employees in the US and Japan may have resulted in the different discourse order used

Table 4
Lexical items used for giving reason to make the request

JJ		AJ		AE	
Akira	*chijin*	Philip	*fiancee*	Mark	fiancee
Tomoo	*fiancee*	John	*fiancee*	Jason	fiancee
Masao	*client*	Steve	*fiancee*	Jeff	fiancee
Toshio	*chijin*	Jim	*fiancee*	Frank	fiancee
Yumio	*fiancee*	David	*fiancee*	Bill	fiancee

by the students. In addition to the order, the influence of these business community's expectations appeared in the subjects' choices of lexical items for the reason they were making the request.

As summarized in Table 4, all the AJs stated their fiancee's arrival as a reason for taking the afternoon off. Two of the JJs used the same excuse. However, two other JJs mentioned only *chijin* which means acquaintance, and avoided mentioning their fiancee's visiting. One of the JJs lied completely, and used picking up one of his clients as a reason for going to the airport.

During the interview with the Japanese subjects after the role play, they commented that the choice of lexical items for the reason heavily depended on their working environment and the relationship with their supervisor. However, they admitted that stating their fiancee's arrival as a reason still would make them uncomfortable (Akira, Tomoo, Masao, Toshio, and Yumio, interview, March 20, 1995). According to Masao, the subject who lied, it would be more appropriate to make up business related reasons even if they were not true (Masao, interview, March 20, 1995). The two subjects, Akira and Toshio, who chose *chijin* (acquaintance) expressed that they felt uncomfortable stating both a lie and a truth. This made them choose the ambiguous lexical item *chijin* which was not a complete lie (Akira and Toshio, interview, March 20, 1995).

Through the interview with the American subjects, it was discussed that all of them were aware of the rules of the Japanese business community. When they worked in Japan, they witnessed that Japanese employees often used sickness or family medical problems as a reason for taking a day off even if it were not true. However, they stated that although they knew that it was accepted in Japanese business culture, they felt very uncomfortable following this rule. In addition, some of the American subjects stated that they did not have to follow the Japanese norm because Japanese supervisors often did not expect foreign employees to follow the rules of the Japanese business community (Philip, John, Steve, Jim, and David, interview, March 27, 1995).

The content of the semantic formula for opening the conversation

The content of the semantic formula of JJs, AJs, and AEs varied in the style of their request opening, yet no significant patterns were observed (see Examples A1, A2, and A3).

The most common statement for the opening in the three groups was asking a favor (e.g., *onegaishitai koto-ga arimasu* or I have a favor to ask you), and asking about the supervisor's availability (e.g., *ojikan yoroshii desu-ka* or Do you have a minute?). These opening expressions are often formulaic. Some of the AJs (Philip and Jim in Example A1) successfully used these formulaic expressions to construct a comfortable situation for making the request. However, some of the AJs (John, Steve and David in Example A2) failed to use them, and only said *sumimasen* (excuse me) to get the supervisor's attention and to try to express his difficult situation.

As appears in the AEs expressions in Example A3, American subjects made a statement for asking a favor (e.g., I have a favor to ask of you) or asked about the supervisor's availability (e.g., do you have a minute?) when they spoke in English. The AEs' style of opening for making a request is very similar to JJs. Thus, the AJs' failure to use appropriate formulaic expressions may not be due to pragmatic transfer. Cohen and Olshtain (1981) found that second language learners deviation in their speech from the native speakers' norm is not only a result of transfer, but also of deficiency in their second language proficiency. Thus, this may be due to the subjects' proficiency level since the two AJs who successfully opened the conversation were in the higher level of two classes while the other three were in the lower level.

The content of semantic formula for making the request

There was an interesting pattern in the Japanese subjects' way of making the request. Four out of five JJs expressed their desire to leave early, and asked the supervisor for permission (Example A4). Their way of expressing desire was quite explicit, yet only one asked the supervisor for permission explicitly. The other three subjects tried to express their intention to seek permission through manipulating the sentence ending *-omotte* (I'm wondering).

On the other hand, the AJs' requests were very implicit. Only one of the AJs expressed his desire to take the afternoon off explicitly. Two of the AJs stated only their intention to go to the airport, but did not make a request for the afternoon off. The other two AJs expressed that they were in a difficult situation, yet they did not make a request for the afternoon off either. However, as appears in Example A6, the American subjects made their requests quite clearly when they spoke in English. One of the AEs asked permission explicitly saying, *would it be okay to take the afternoon off?* Interestingly the other four AEs asked permission by using exactly the same expression, *I was wondering*.

Since American subjects made requests clearly when they spoke English, the AJs' ambiguity in making a request may not be the result of pragmatic transfer. As Beebe and Takahashi (1989) demonstrated, it is more reasonable to consider it as an overgeneralization of a stereotype of the Japanese speech style. As Americans study Japanese, the politeness forms in Japanese speech are emphasized. This may have resulted in the AJs' avoidance of a direct request.

Conclusions

The analyses of the data on making a request provide an interesting picture of the difference between Japanese and American business cultures. By examining the order of the speech act production, it was found that the Japanese subjects felt it to be more face-threatening to state the reason for the request if the reason were a private matter. In contrast, the American subjects started by providing reasons to soften the awkward situation of making a request. These differences also appeared in their choice of lexical items for the reason they were making the request. Whereas the American subjects felt that it was appropriate to bring up a private matter as a reason, the Japanese subjects tried to avoid mentioning a private matter, and in one case lied. These cultural differences were transferred when Americans spoke Japanese.

No significant cultural differences were observed in the semantic formula for opening the conversation. Since the opening speech acts are oftentimes formulaic, the subjects' lower proficiency in Japanese resulted in the unsuccessful performances.

JJs and AEs shared a similar speech style for the semantic formula for making a request. However, when Americans spoke Japanese, their ways of making a request were very indirect and vague. This may be due to Americans' overgeneralization of stereotypes of Japanese speech styles.

While conducting the follow-up interviews with the subjects, it was found that although the American subjects were aware of the rules of Japanese speech styles, they did not necessarily try to follow them. The American learners of Japanese used various strategies to look for a style in which they would not commit a violation of the rules, and also one in which they were comfortable. This study suggests that the target forms are not necessarily the learners' goal. Language teachers need to reconsider the teaching of appropriateness for second language learners.

References

Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-74). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Beebe, L., & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: Chastisement and disagreement. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 199-218). New York: Plenum.

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": Learning how to compliment in English. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 6*(2), 31-48.

Billmyer, K., Jakar, V., & Lee, M. P. (1989). Developing pragmatic awareness through communicatively oriented materials. Paper presented at the first annual Pedagogy and Pragmatics Colloquium at the International TESOL Convention in San Antonio, TX.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in politeness usage. Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-289) Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociolinguistic competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning, 31,* 113-134.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). 'I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 167-185.

Fukushima, S. (1990). Offers and requests: Performance by Japanese learners of English. *World Englishes, 9,* 317-325.

Hymes, D. (1972a). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: Ethnography of communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hymes, D. (1972b). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second of foreign language* (pp. 154-169). New York: Newbury House.

Paulston, C. B. (1974). Linguistics and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly, 8,* 347-367.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wolfson, N. (1983). Rules of speaking. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication.* London: Longman.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Mitsuo Kubota is a PhD student in educational linguistics at the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania. He currently teachers Japanese in the Language and Cultural Perspectives Program at the Joseph H. Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies. His research interests include issues regarding the teaching and learning of communicative competence in language education

Appendix A

Transcribed Data

Example 1 *The content of semantic formula for opening of Japanese subjects speaking Japanese (JJ)*

Akira: *Statement of asking a favor*
ano kubota-san chotto onegaishitai koto-ga arun-desu
well Mr.Kubota little want to ask thing there is
well there is a little thing I want to ask you

Tomoo: *Apology*
ano chotto totuzen-de moushiwakenain desu-ga
well little suddenly sorry though
well I'm sorry to ask you suddenly though

Masao: *Getting attention*
ano chotto desune
well little
well

Toshio: *Asking the supervisor's availability*
kakarichou ima yoroshii deshyou-ka
supervisor now available
supervisor, are you available now?

Yumio: *Asking the supervisor's availability*
ima ojikan yoroshii desu-ka
now time available
do you have time now?

Example 2 *The content of semantic formula for opening of American subjects speaking Japanese (AJ)*

Philip: *Statement of asking a favor*
ano chotto nakanaka totsuzen-de shitsurei nan-desuga
well little very suddenly rude though
although it is rude to ask you suddenly

onegai-ga arimasu-ga
favor there is
I have a favor to ask you

John: *Getting attention*
sumimasen ano
Excuse me well
Excuse me well

Steve: *Expressing difficulty*
anone etto aa nante iunoka muzukashii koto nan-desuga
well well ah how say difficult thing though
well well how do you say? although it is difficult to ask

Jim: *Statement of asking a favor*
ano kubota-kakarichou,
well Mr. Kubota,
well Mr.Kubota,

ano chotto onegai shitai koto-ga arun-desuga
well little ask want thing there is
I have a little favor to ask you

David: *Getting attention*
sumimasen kubota kakarichyou
excuse me Mr. kubota
Excuse me, Mr. Kubota

Example 3 *The content of semantic formula for opening of American subjects speaking English (AE)*

Mark: *Statement of asking a favor*
I have a favor to ask of you, if I could

Jason: *Question*
Ah, a quick question on tomorrow,
what does the afternoon look like?

Jeff: *Asking the supervisors' availability*
Simon, do you have a minute?
something unusual has come up, and I'd
like to ask you a small favor, please

Frank: *Statement of asking a favor*
I want to ask you something
I've got the following situation

Bill: *Statement of asking a favor*
Ah, I'd like to ask you a favor

Example 4 *The content of semantic formula for request of Japanese subjects speaking Japanese (JJ)*

Akira: hayai jikan-ni soutai sasete-itadakereba-to omotte
early time leave early let me wonder
I wonder if you would let me leave a little early

Tomoo: mosi sashitukae nakereba soutai sasete-itadakereba
if problem not leave early let me
if it's not a problem, could I leave early

Masao: gohandan-o ukagai-taito omoimashite
judgement ask want to think
I would like to ask your permission

Toshio: ni jikan bakari seki-o hazusasete itadakitain-desukedo
two hours about seat leave let me
I would like you to let me leave about two hours

ii desyou-ka
okay
is it okay

Yumio: soutai sasete itadakenai deshyou-ka
leave early let me is it possible
is it possible to let me leave early?

Example 5 *The content of semantic formula for request of American subjects speaking Japanese (AJ)*

Philip: kuukou made mukae-ni iki-tainodesu
airport to pick up go want to
I want to go to the airport to pick her up

John: asu naritakuukou-ni ikimasu
tomorrow Narita airport to I will go
I will go to Narita airport tomorrow

Steve: soutai sasete kudasai
leave early let me please
please let me leave early

Jim: chotto komatte imasu
little trouble in
I'm in a little trouble

David: chotto shinpai shite imasu
little worried
I'm a little worried

Example 6 *The content of semantic formula for request of American subjects speaking English (AE)*

Mark: I was wondering if I could take off at one today

Jason: I was wondering if I could take the afternoon off

Jeff: I was wondering....

Frank: would it be okay to take the afternoon off

Bill: I was wondering if I could take the afternoon off

Appendix B

Scenario for the role play

For American subjects speaking English:

1. You are an American business-person who works in Tokyo.

2. Yesterday, your fiance/e in the U.S. called you and said that s/he suddenly decided to visit Japan.

3. S/he will arrive at the Tokyo international airport at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

4. Since it takes at least 2 hours to get to the airport, ask your supervisor for the afternoon off.

5. Start by knocking on the supervisor's door.

For Japanese subjects speaking Japanese:

1. あなたは日本の銀行のニューヨーク支店に勤務駿する日本人Aです。

2. 昨日、アメルカの婚約者から突然に電話があり、彼(彼女)が明日ニューヨークに来ることを知らされました。

3. 飛行機は、明日の午後3時にJFKに到着します。あなたが空港に迎えに行かないと、彼(彼女)はとても悲しみます。

4. 系長に失礼のないように、午後の早退を申し込んでください。

5. 系長室のドアをノックするところから始めてください。

For American subjects speaking Japanese, the following vocabulary list was provided with the scenario:

1. あなたは日本の商社の東京支店に勤務駿する
アメリカ人Aです。

2. 昨日、アメルカの婚約者から突然に電話があり、
彼(彼女)が明日日本に来ることを知らされました。

3. 飛行機は、明日の午後3時に成田に到着します。
あなたが空港に迎えに行かないと、彼(彼女)は
とても悲しみます。

4. 系長に失礼のないように、午後の早退を申し込んで
ください。

5. 系長室のドアをノックするところから始めて
ください。

勤務する	きんむする
婚約者	こんやくしゃ
突然に	とつぜん
悲しむ	かなしむ
失礼	しつれい
早退する	そうたい

For American subjects speaking Japanese, the following vocabulary list was provided with the scenario:

1. あなたは日本の商社の東京支店に勤務駿する
アメリカ人Aです。

2. 昨日、アメルカの婚約者から突然に電話があり、
彼(彼女)が明日日本に来ることを知らされました。

3. 飛行機は、明日の午後3時に成田に到着します。
あなたが空港に迎えに行かないと、彼(彼女)は
とても悲しみます。

4. 系長に失礼のないように、午後の早退を申し込んで
ください。

5. 系長室のドアをノックするところから始めて
ください。

勤務する	きんむする
婚約者	こんやくしゃ
突然に	とつぜん
悲しむ	かなしむ
失礼	しつれい
早退する	そうたい

Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion Tests

Manka Varghese & Kristine Billmyer

University of Pennsylvania
English Language Programs
Graduates School of Education

A significant and long-standing dilemma in sociolinguistic research concerns the methods used to collect the data, the validity of different types of data, and to quote Kasper and Dahl (1991) "...their adequacy to approximate authentic performance of linguistic action." (p. 215). As early as 1966 Labov detected variability among the same subjects depending solely on the instruments used by the researcher to collect data. More recently, Kasper and Dahl noted that in the study of pragmatics, "...we are dealing with a double layer of variability" (p.215): the first layer being that of sociolinguistic variability and the second layer being that of variability induced by the different data instruments. Some researchers have claimed that the most authentic data in sociolinguistic research is spontaneous speech gathered by ethnographic observation (Manes & Wolfson 1981). However, difficulties in relying solely on this method are well-documented (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989), and have led to the wide use of an elicitation procedure called the Discourse Completion Test (DCT). This paper examines the internal structure of Discourse Completion Tests and, in particular, investigates the effect of systematic modification to the DCT situational prompt on subject response.

Adapted in 1982 by Blum-Kulka for the purpose of investigating speech acts, the DCT is a questionnaire containing a set of very briefly described situations designed to elicit a particular speech act. Subjects read each situation and respond to a prompt in writing.

Advantages of this method are well-known. Without question the DCT surpasses all others in ease of use, and as Beebe and Cummings (1985) conclude, result in the researcher's ability to collect a very large corpus of data, on a wide range of difficult-to-observe speech behaviors, in a short period of time. More importantly, they note, data elicited with this instrument are consistent with naturally occurring data, at least in the main patterns and formulas. These factors have led to the widespread use of DCTs in numerous speech act studies (Olshtain & Cohen 1983; Eisenstein & Bodman 1986; Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz 1985) including the most

ambitious research project on speech acts to date, the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project - CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) which investigated requests and apologies across 13 languages.

Notwithstanding its appeal, critics have leveled charges at the instrument itself and have found disturbing discrepancies between DCT and spoken data. Beebe and Cummings (1985) found that DCTs failed to elicit the full range of formulas found in spoken data, and that they elicited responses more limited in length and deficient in the level of elaboration and frequency of repetition typical of human spoken interaction. Critics targeting design of the instrument itself cite the insufficiency of social and situational information in the situational prompt, omitting such things as background to the event, information on role relationship between the subject and the imaginary interlocutor, frequency of their interaction, and details of context and setting (Wolfson, Marmor & Jones 1989). What is missing according to Beebe and Cummings is the entire psychosocial dimension, which they point out, sets up a desire on the part of interlocutors to establish and maintain one's reputation with the expectation of a possible future relationship. Without setting the scene in a Hymesian sense (Hymes 1972), respondents are left to their own devices to invent one of their own situations, which could vary considerably from respondent to respondent, or more likely, not to invent one at all.

Nonetheless, it is evident that speakers in natural conversation have access to this powerful combination of interpersonal and contextual details, and that their unconscious continuous assessment of this information has an impact on their utterances.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate whether enhancing the DCT situation itself, by including a similar level and array of information afforded speakers in spontaneous interactions, would result in DCT data more closely approximating authentic performance. Although previous studies have compared DCTs to other methods of data collection (see Kasper & Dahl 1991), only Rose (1992) has investigated the structure of DCTs, by comparing data elicited by situations with and without a hearer response added after the situation. However, Rose concluded that appending a hearer response had no significant effect on the data elicited. This study differs from Rose's in that it manipulates the internal content of the DCT situation and then asks what impact, if any, such manipulation has on the data elicited.

Construction of the DCT

This study examines 3 versions of a DCT designed to elicit requests. Situations for all three versions are derived from descriptions of situations used in the CCSARP project on requests (Blum-Kulka, et al. 1989), and later formulated by Rose, without hearer response. The CCSARP study provides an arena for comparing results because of the specific coding in-

structions the researchers put together for data analysis, and also because of the likelihood that subjects in this study would be familiar with the situations.

Version I (Original) uses the Rose situations, all of which embed in the situation information on requestive goal, social distance, and social dominance. These situations were modified slightly in the following ways. First, to encourage as full a response as possible, the response space was lengthened to 4" by 8.5". Next, in order to ascertain the respondents' assessment of both level of imposition and the interlocutor's likelihood of compliance, two questions were included after each situation. Finally, the emphasis of the speaker in the two hearer-dominant situations was changed so that subjects would actually take the roles of the librarian and professor rather than try to imagine from a distance how both of these individuals would respond. Below is an example of the Version I - Music situation. All of the Version I situations are found in Appendix A.

Example 1. Version I - Original: Music Situation

> You are trying to study in your room and you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You don't know the student, but you decide to ask them to turn the music down. What would you say?

Version II (Elaborated) was constructed by examining the literature to identify the type of social, contextual and psychological information critics of DCTs found lacking in the situations and others in the field regarded as necessary and relevant (Wolfson, Marmor & Jones 1989; Beebe & Cummings 1985; Hymes 1972). Appendix B identifies the variables which were selected for inclusion in each situation and either stated explicitly or implied. In addition to information on requestive goal, social distance and social dominance, the following information was included: the gender of the interlocutor, role relationship, length of acquaintance, the frequency of interaction, whether or not the relationship was optional, and a description of the setting, all of which set the scene psychologically. Below is an example of the elaborated Version II Music situation in which time and place are described, the interlocutor is given a name, along with some history to the request, thus providing the speaker with motivation for the ensuing act. The six Version II - Elaborated situations are found in Appendix C.

Example 2. Version II - Elaborated: Music Situation

> It is 10:30 p.m. on a Wednesday night and you have a paper due the next day. You are trying to finish the paper and you can't concentrate because you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You decide to ask her to turn the music down. The

music has been on at this volume for half an hour. You have occasionally seen the student, Lucy Row, in the same dorm during the past six months. She is a student like you but you have never spoken to her. You have heard other people in the dorm complain about the volume of her music on several occasions although you never have because you usually study in the library. However, today the library closed early. You are only half way through and you know that the professor for this class is very strict and does not give extensions. What would you say?

Version III (Timed) used exactly the same situational prompts as Version II (Elaborated) and then added one dimension: instructions to respondents were altered and subjects were asked to reflect on each situation for 30 seconds before writing their response (see Appendix D). This was done in order to encourage subjects to immerse themselves as much as possible in the psychosocial domain of each situation. Ultimately, we wondered if factors external to the situations themselves, and intrinsic to the test administration would have any effect on outcomes.

The Study

The subjects were 55 native speakers of American English, who were undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Pennsylvania. Although data from 32 non-native speakers were also collected, analysis of their responses is not included in this report and will be the subject of a later study. Version I (Original) was administered to twenty students, ten males and ten females; Version II (Elaborated) was administered to nineteen students, ten males and nine females. Version III (Timed) was administered to sixteen students, eight males and eight females. All three forms of the questionnaires were assigned randomly to each group. Data were collected primarily in classrooms, and subjects were not informed of the purpose of the study.

Data were then coded using the Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) and Rose (1992) coding scheme. The main categories of analysis were as follows:

1) Request strategies of the head act (frequency and type)

2) Internal modification of the head act (type and frequency)

3) Length of the entire request act including the head act and internal and external modification (mean number of words)

4) External modification of the head act (type and frequency)

Results and Discussion

Request Strategies of the Head Act

We first examined the head act of each request. A head act is defined by Blum-Kulka, et al. (1989) as "...the minimal unit which can realize a request." (p. 275) and excludes those parts of the act sequence which are not essential. The first category of analysis was the coding of requests by type of strategy. We began with the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al.) project's coding scheme and coded requests into 9 different types of strategies as shown in Appendix E. Following this initial step the strategies were collapsed into the following three main categories:

1) Direct strategies, D, where the understanding relies on syntactic devices or the semantic content of the utterance, such as,

Clean up this mess, please.

2) Conventionally indirect strategies, CI, where interpretation is aided by conventional usage,

How about cleaning up?

or reference to a preparatory condition,

Could you clean up the kitchen, please?

and finally,

3) Nonconventionally indirect strategies, NI, which includes strong or mild hints as in

You left this kitchen in a right mess.

Table 1 displays the frequency distribution of requests by the three main categories, Direct (D), Conventionally Indirect (CI) and Nonconventionally Indirect (NI). A chi-square test revealed no significant differences across versions in the distribution of request strategies in four situations. Although there appear to be significant differences in the Music and Extension situations, we feel that a claim of statistical significance would be improper due to the existence of too many empty cells in the chi-square for these situations.

In essence, the head act request strategy, appears to be unaffected by the addition of social and contextual information which Versions II (Elabo-

Table 1
Frequency distribution of request strategies

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN.	PRESENT
Version	D C N	D C N	D C N	D C N	D C N	D C N
1(n=20)	4 15 0	2 18 0	0 13 1	8 9 1	0 14 2	1 14 1
2(n=19)	0 19 0	0 18 1	2 16 1	2 14 1	1 10 8	1 16 2
3(n=16)	0 13 0	0 14 0	0 9 4	3 12 1	2 14 0	2 13 0
		p <0.026				p<0.014

p < 0.05

Table 2.
Mean downgraders per request

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	1.1	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.5
2(n=19)	1.3	1	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.6
3(n=16)	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.5

p = 0.032

p< 0.05

rated) and III (Timed) supplied. Overall, there was an overwhelming choice of conventionally indirect strategies across versions and in most situations. This indeed has been the main finding of the CCSARP project as well as the main finding of request studies using naturally occurring data. In fact, this area - main patterns and formulas - is the most widely-cited category of analysis where typical DCT data seem to replicate spoken data.

Head Act: Internal Modification

The next category of analysis, that of internal modification to the head act, was identified to determine whether amplified content had any bearing on how a speaker mitigated the request within the core act. The types of internal modification found were primarily downgraders, which include lexical and syntactic ways of softening the request, and a few instances of upgraders which intensify the request. Lexical downgraders include politeness markers such as *please*, consultative devices, *do you think*,

Table 3
Mean words per request

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	14.2	12.8	24.4	10.0	22.6	17.3
2(n=19)	28.8	35.3	31.0	19.3	47.7	42.3
3(n=16)	23.8	31.6	33.7	18.8	49.7	39.0
	p = 0.042	p = 0.001		p = 0.005	p = 0.004	p = 0.001

p< 0.05

understaters or hedges like, *a bit*, as in, *Could you do your paper a bit earlier*. Syntactic downgraders include the use of tense and aspect, such as *I was wondering if...*, conditional clauses, and the use of the interrogative.

As the results of an ANOVA in Table 2 show, no significant differences were found in the use of downgraders across versions, except in the Notes situation. There, the difference was between Versions I (Original) and II (Elaborated) only.

In fact, the low mean value of downgraders, fewer than one per request across all situations, suggests that subjects are not mitigating their requests in the head act much at all. Thus far, our analysis of the core of the request - the head act - shows two things. First, that manipulation of situational content has no effect on choice of request strategy or amount of internal modification; and second that the overwhelming preference for conventionally indirect strategies seen here is consistent with previous studies which examine both naturally occurring and DCT data.

Length of the entire request act

We next compared the mean length of the entire request act across all three versions. As Table 3 shows the mean length of the request act in Versions II (Elaborated) and III (Timed) was two to three times greater than in the context-poor Version I (Original). An analysis of variance revealed significant differences in five of the six situations: the Music, Notes, Library, Extension and Presentation in mean length of response.

A post hoc comparison of means using the Scheffe test revealed that the significant differences were between the context-poor and both context rich-versions (Version I - Original and Version II - Elaborated; and between Version I-Original and Version III-Timed). No differences were found between the two context-rich versions (Versions II and III), leading us to conclude that instructions to the subjects to imagine themselves in the situation for 30 seconds before writing a response, produced no variation.

The difference in length can be illustrated by two typical examples of responses from Version I (Original) and Version II (Elaborated).

Example 3: Version I-Original: Music Situation

" I'm trying to study. Could you please turn down the music a little?"

And

Example 4: Version II-Elaborated: Music Situation

" Lucy, I'm really sorry to bother you, but if possible could you please lower the volume a little. Tomorrow I have a paper due and I'm really stressed out."

As one can see, the requestive head act in both versions is almost identical. Differences between response data from the context-poor versus context-rich versions lie almost exclusively outside the head act, a topic we will turn to next.

External Modification

The last major category of analysis is external modification, moves which occur outside the request head act. Two subcategories, supportive moves and alerters, were examined separately.

1) Supportive Moves

Supportive moves are ways that the speaker aggravates or mitigates an utterance. These include such acts as getting a precommitment (Could you do me a favor), disarmers (I'll give your notes right back), grounders (I had trouble with the data collection) and promises of reward (You can borrow my notes anytime).

Overall, the mean number of supportive moves in data elicited by the Elaborated and Timed situations (Versions II and III) was two to three times greater than the mean number of supportive moves in the context-poor Original situations (Version I data). Table 4 gives the results of an ANOVA of mean supportive moves per request and shows significant differences in all of the situations except for Music. The Scheffe test revealed, as expected, in all cases the differences were between the Original context-poor version (Version I) and both enriched versions (Versions II and III). No significant differences appeared between the Elaborated and Timed versions (Versions II and III). Data from the Presentation situations illustrates the differences between the elaborated and original versions.

Example 5: Version I - Original: Presentation Situation

"I was really hoping that you could present your paper one week earlier."

This request contains no external modification in the form of supportive moves.

Table 4
Mean supportive moves per request

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.6	1.3	0.5
2(n=19)	1.9	2.4	2.1	1.2	3.1	2.3
3(n=16)	2.0	2.5	2.3	2.0	3.0	2.7
	p = 0.016	p = 0.048		p = 0.042	p = 0.003	p = 0.001

$p < 0.05$

The above example can be contrasted with a typical example of a request act taken from the Presentation situation for the Elaborated Version II, which includes a variety of supportive moves.

Example 6: Elaborated Version II: Presentation Situation

"Nancy, you are one of the strongest students in the department so I am hoping you can do me a favor. If you can't, it's no problem but we're studying the subject relevant to your presentation then. Can you get it ready? If not, it's okay."

The above response elicited by the elaborated prompt in Version II contains two imposition minimizers (*If you can't it's no problem* and *If not, it's okay*), a grounder (*we're studying the subject relevant to your presentation*) and a precommitment (*I am hoping that you can do me a favor*).

When we examined the types of supportive moves elicited by the two context-rich versions (Versions II and III), we found many more promises of reward, such as *I'll be more lenient with you for the grading*, and disarmers, such as *I know you have a lot of work*. We also saw other speech acts such as compliments present in the Elaborated Version II example above, as well as expressions of gratitude and apologies. All of these were found in abundance in data elicited by the elaborated and timed situations (Versions II and III) but hardly ever appeared in data elicited by the original situations (Version I).

Explanation for these findings is given by Beebe and Cummings (1985) who maintain that a typical DCT situation (similar to Version I situations) "...does not bring out the real...dynamics of natural interaction between members of a group" (p. 8). This is because respondents are addressing an anonymous fictional character and have no motivation to establish or preserve a relationship. And we saw evidence of this in the minimalist data elicited by the original context-poor (Version I) situations. However, the

enhancement of social, situational, and psychological content in Versions II and III may have provided respondents with a greater sense that they were interacting with a real person, in a real place and time, and more motivation to establish or maintain their reputation and rapport with the human being they were addressing. As our data show, when the psychosocial dimension of the situational prompt is augmented, then the written responses become more elaborated in much the same way speech in natural spontaneous interactions happens: with excuses and reasons, promises, and other means of saving one's own face and minimizing potential damage to another's.

2) Alerters

The second type of external modification we examined were alerters which are ways to warn the hearer of an upcoming speech act. Alerters include names and address terms, such as Tom, or Professor Smith, or attention getters such as Excuse me. Alerters were counted as one for an address term, an attention getter, or a combination of both.

The results of a chi square on the frequency distribution of alerters are reported in Table 5. They show that alerters appeared three times more frequently in data from the Elaborated and Timed versions (Versions II and III) than in data from the Original version (Version 1) in four of the six situations except for the Music and Ride situations.

It is possible that the supplemental information provided in these situations (Versions II and III), and, in particular, the interlocutor's names which were supplied in five situations gave subjects a "you are there" feel to the setting and succeeded in prompting them to frame the ensuing speech act with an alerter. A somewhat unexpected finding was the large number of alerters in the Library situation in spite of the fact that the hearer's name was not supplied. An explanation for this finding may be found in the situation itself, in which the librarian is interrupting a student who is speaking to someone else, thus resulting in a high frequency of "excuse me" type alerters.

Table 5:
Frequency distribution: alerters

Version	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	6	3	10	3	3	1
2(n=19)	10	12	14	8	12	11
3(n=16)	9	9	12	12	12	10
		$p < 0.003$		$p < 0.003$	$p < 0.003$	$p < 0.001$

$p < 0.05$

In the overall category of external modification, one could argue that the specific information supplied in the elaborated and timed versions (i.e., names, background to the relationship, contextual details) are inducing the respondents to perform more supportive work and use alerters. This may be the case. On the other hand, in real social interactions, participants are always surrounded by the context, are privy to background to the relationship, they know the names of their interlocutors and often have ready-made excuses to call upon when they need to make requests. In the elaborated and timed situations, respondents were given this same information and the option, as they would have in real life, to use it or not. In fact, in the original version (Version I) Extension situation, five respondents noted in parentheses that they would give a reason for not being able to complete their paper even though they were unable to formulate one at the time in writing. So the urge to mitigate the head act in some way is present, if not in the actual responses, at least in the respondents' minds.

Other Results

Finally, the Blum-Kulka et al.(1989) coding scheme was abandoned in order to examine qualities of the data which the coding scheme was not able to capture. We saw examples in data from the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) of respondents constructing dialogues with their imaginary interlocutor, and even including paralinguistic information such as the next example illustrates:

Example 7. Version III - Timed: Music Situation

" I would knock on her door and say, 'Would you please turn down your music down." (not as a question). She will say OK and sorry. I will smile firmly and say, "Thanks."

Some even combined an initial one-sided dialogue with a very elaborate narrative preamble to the request, as the example below shows.

Example 8. Version III - Timed: Notes Situation

" Hey Tom, how's it going? Have you been keeping up with the 76ers? No? Well, I tell you last week's game was incredible. Yeah, it went into triple overtime and the 76ers won. Afterwards, my roommates dragged me out to the local bar and we had a few drinks. Unfortunately, I was a bit hung over and missed class. I know I've already borrowed your notes twice this semester but I was wondering if I could see last week's notes. I have an old exam and we should study for the final together next week. I'll give you a call. Hey, take care and go 76ers!"

Again, it seems that when subjects are invited into a richer interpersonal context, even on paper, they are able to envision a more complex

relationship with their interlocutor and are able to call upon a much wider array of linguistic resources.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, no significant differences were found across versions in either measure of the request head act itself, specifically: 1) the distribution of head act request strategies across the three major categories, direct, conventionally indirect, or nonconventionally indirect, or 2) forms of internal modification to the head act, namely the frequency of lexical and syntactic softening devices. The preference for conventionally indirect request strategies in this study is consistent with previous DCT studies of requests (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) and studies of naturally occurring requests.

However, significant differences in response data were found between the unelaborated and both elaborated versions (between Versions I and II and between Versions I and III) on the following measures:

1) Mean length of entire request act in both the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) was two to three times longer than the mean length of the request act in the original Version I, in five out of six situations.

2) In the category of external modification there were two findings: the mean number of supportive moves was two to three times greater in both the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) than in the original version (Version I) in five out of six situations; furthermore, the frequency of alerters was three times greater in both the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) than in the original version (Version I) in four out of six situations.

Finally, no differences were found on any measure between the elaborated version (Version II) and the timed version (Version III).

The limitations of this study include the lack of distracter items in the questionnaire so that respondents would not be able to infer the subject of the study and the, as yet, unfinished check on inter-rater reliability. Since the design of this study failed to compare the original version with and without a 30-second pause, it was not possible to really ascertain whether the variation in response data for the timed version was a factor of the elaborated situational prompts or a factor of the additional time subjects were asked to ponder each situation, or a combination of both.

In conclusion, it appears that certain components of the request act are sensitive to variation in the internal structure of the DCT, but others are not. When these findings are placed alongside those studies which compare oral data with written DCT data, some interesting patterns emerge. The head act appears to be a 'hard-wired' component of requests. This is

borne out by the remarkable regularity with which conventionally indirect strategies occur in data gathered by both elicited and observational methods. When we look beyond the head act, to the external parts of the request, the data elicited by means of elaborated DCT situations look more like oral face-to-face interactions than do data elicited by means of the typically brief, context-impoverished DCT situations. When subjects are given more information in the situations, they appear to modify their discourse in ways closer to natural conversation.

Therefore, it may be that certain types of written prompts are more powerful than others, and that some are strong enough to simulate the psychosocial dimension of live situations. If this were the case, researchers might be able to trust a written instrument to elicit speech act data more comparable to natural speech. A great deal more research needs to be conducted on the limits of such methods, and careful consideration given to the overall value of elicited written data in investigations of speech behavior. Nevertheless, examining the internal structure of data collection instruments is an important and fruitful area for further study.

References

Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. (1985). *Speech act performance: A function of the data collection procedure?* Paper presented at the Sixth Annual TESOL and Sociolinguistics Colloquim at the International TESOL Convention, New York.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R., (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Anderson, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behavior. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 123-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1989). *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). I very appreciate: Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 167-185.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 215-247.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 115-132). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Rose, K. (1992). Speech act research and written questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 17: 49-62.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Manka Varghese is a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and an ESL lecturer at the English Language Programs at the University of Pennsylvania.

Kristine Billmyer is Director of the English Language Programs at Penn and adjunct professor in educational linguistics at the Graduate School of Education.

Appendix A

Situations in Version 1 (Rose, 1992)

1) You are trying to study in your room and you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You don't know the student, but you decide to ask them to turn the music down. What would you say?

2) You missed class and need to borrow a friend's notes. What would you say?

3) You need a ride home from school. You notice someone who lives down the street from you is also at school, but you haven't spoken to this person before. You think they might have a car. What would you say?

4) A student in the library is making too much noise and disturbing other students . The librarian decides to ask the student to quiet down. What will the librarian say?

5) Your term paper is due, but you haven't finished it yet. You want to ask the professor for an extension. What would you say?

6) A professor wants a student to present a paper in class a week earlier than scheduled. What would the professor say?

Appendix B

Checklist for variables	*Situations*
CONTENT	1 2 3 4 5 6
Gender of interlocutor	
Social Distance	
Role relationship	
Requestive goal	
Length of acquaintanceship	
Imposition/Privacy(hearer's perception)	
Frequency of interaction(explicit)	
Optionality of relationship(explicit)	
Compliance likelihood of interlocutor	
Setting and scene (time, place, circumstances and psychological)	

Appendix C

Situations in Versions 2 and 3

1) It is 10:30 p.m. on a Wednesday night and you have a paper due the next day. You are trying to finish the paper and you can't concentrate because you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You decide to ask her to turn the music down. The music has been on at this volume for half an hour. You have occasionally seen the student, Lucy Row, in the same dorm during the past six months. She is a student like you but you have never spoken to her. You have heard other people in the dorm complain about the volume of her music on several occasions although you never have because you usually study in the library. However today the library closed early. You are only half way through and you know that the professor for this class is very strict and does not give extensions. What would you say?

2) You are at the end of a history class and you are sitting next to Tom Yates. You missed last week's class and need to borrow his notes. He has been in the same program as you for one year and see him socially about once a month in a group. You will also be taking classes together in the future.. He is a good note taker and one of the best students in the class. You have borrowed his notes twice before for the same class and the last time you borrowed them he was reluctant to give them up. In two weeks you both have the final exam for your class. What would you say?

3) It's 5.30 p.m., your last class has just finished and you need a ride home. You realize that a fellow classmate who was supposed to give you a ride is not in class today. You have a lot of books with you tonight, the snow has made walking difficult and you need a ride home form school. As you come out of class, you see Alice Thomas, an assistant professor in the department who teaches a class that ends at the same time as yours. She lives on the same street as you and she is standing talking to some other students. She is smiling and laughing. You have never spoken to her before but you have seen her on occasion in the department in the last few months and have both nodded to each other once or twice in the neighborhood. You know that she has a car and once saw her give a lift to one of the students. What would you say?

4) It is the end of the working day on Friday. You are a librarian and have been working in the University Reserve Room for two years. You like your job and usually the Reserve Room is quiet. Today, a student is making noise and disturbing other students. You decide to ask the student to quiet down. The student is a male student who you have often seen work on his own in the past two months but today he is explaining something to another student in a very loud voice. A lot of students are in the library and they are studying for their mid-term exams. You notice that some of the other students are looking in his direction in an annoyed manner. What would you say?

5) Your term paper is due for a course in your major, but you haven't finished it yet. You want to ask the professor for an extension. You had a lot of difficulty collecting data for the paper, but you think you finally have enough and the paper will be really good if you could have another week to put it together. Your professor is Dr. Robert Smith, senior member of the department and possibly your thesis advisor, if things go as you hope they will. You have done well in this course up to now, and he is aware of the problem with data collection. You took one course with Dr. Smith at the beginning of your studies a year and a half ago and got an A, but you haven't had much opportunity to interact with him since then. You have an appointment with Dr. Smith a few days before the paper is due. You know he rarely gives extensions on term papers because he is usually very busy and immediately after this semester is over he will leave the campus to do field work. However, you think you might have a chance because the paper is on a topic he is interested in. You are in his office now. What would you say?

6) You (an associate professor teaching a course in psychology) want a student to present a paper in a class a week earlier than scheduled. It is the middle of the term and topics were assigned at the beginning of the course. The presentation is 15-minute class summary and critique of a supplementary journal article. Your student is Nancy Porter, a very competent student who always contributes to class discussions and is very well prepared for class. Even though you have never had her in class before this semester, she has a reputation as one of the best students in the department. You want her to present next week instead of three weeks from now because her article is more relevant to next week's lecture. However, midterm exams are next week and you know she has a heavy course load. She has made several contributions during this class, and has been given some good feedback from you. You ask her if you could see her for a minute after class. The students have all left and you are talking to her alone. What would you say?

Appendix D

Version #3

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each situation and imagine yourself in it. Please reflect for 30 seconds and then write down what you would say. Use as much or as little space as you need. Finally, please answer the questions that follow each situation.

1) It is 10:30 p.m. on a Wednesday night and you have a paper due the next day. You are trying to finish the paper and you can't concentrate because you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You decide to ask her to turn the music down. The music has been on at this volume for half an hour. You have occasionally seen the student, Lucy Row, in the same dorm during the past six months. She is a student like you but you have never spoken to her. You have heard other people in the dorm complain about the volume of her music on several occasions although you never have because you usually study in the library. However today the library closed early. You are only half way through and you know that the professor for this class is very strict and does not give extensions. What would you say?

YOU:

How imposed upon do you think Lucy will feel?

not imposed upon		moderately imposed upon		very imposed upon
1	2	3	4	5

How likely do you think Lucy is to comply?

not likely		moderately likely		very likely
1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E

Request Strategies

Direct

Clean up this mess, please.	Mood Derivable
I'm asking you not to park the car here.	Explicit Performative
I would like you to give your lecture a week earlier.	Hedged Performative
Madam, you'll have to move your car.	Locution Derivable
I'd really wish you'd stop bothering me.	Scope Stating

Conventionally Indirect

How about cleaning up?	Suggestory Formula
Could you clear up the kitchen please?	Preparatory Condition

Nonconventionally Indirect

You've left this kitchen in a right mess.	Strong Hint
I'm a nun. (In response to a persistent boy)	Mild Hint

(Blum-Kulka et al., 1989)

Dictogloss: Is It An Effective Language Learning Task?

Toshiyo Nabei

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

SLA studies on interaction support the hypothesis that negotiation is a useful context for language learning. Based on the assumption that learners' awareness of language form facilitates their language learning, Kowal and Swain (1994) claimed that dictogloss was an effective language learning task since the task provide a context for negotiation. This paper examines learners' interaction in the interactional stage of dictogloss to see how it might facilitate L2 learning.The learners' interaction suggests that the four procedural stages of the task are all important for language learning.

Studies on the nature of communicative interaction in the field of SLA have compiled empirical evidence which support the belief that language is best learned and taught through interaction (Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun 1993: 10). Researchers who share this perspective of language learning process seem to agree on the importance of negotiation as the context for language learning. Negotiation is defined as an activity in which interlocutors work linguistically to resolve the communication difficulty identified by one of the interlocutors (Pica 1992: 200). This process involves various interactional modifications which help to overcome communication difficulties (Pica 1994: 497; Varonis & Gass 1985: 151). Indeed, some empirical studies on negotiation have shown powerful support for the claim that negotiation is helpful in order to make meaning comprehensible for the L2 learners (Pica, Young, & Doughty 1987: 753; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989: 84). Negotiation, thus, is believed to be useful context for language learning.

Furthermore, some researchers who questioned the process of internalization of linguistic data began to consider the value of linguistic production by learners. Swain (1985: 249) claimed that learners' stretching to produce comprehensible output would be important for the internalization of linguistic forms and the acquisition of the target language. Swain and her colleagues believe that language learners need to be pushed into syntactic processing (Swain 1985: 249; Kowal & Swain 1994). In order to internalize target syntax, students need to be aware of the relationship between meaning, form, and function that are closely intertwined (Kowal & Swain 1994).

These researchers thought that such linguistic awareness would facilitate L2 learners' language learning.

While the negotiation process which was composed of linguistic input, output, and feedback, was considered to be helpful for effective language learning, various researchers sought ideal techniques to provide learners with such context (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun 1993: 10). One answer that they found was use of language learning tasks. In general, language learning tasks are characterized as goal-oriented classroom activities in which language learners exchange information and communicate for the purpose of a meaningful outcome (Nunan 1989: 10-11; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun 1993: 11-12). Under this definition, various classroom activities such as the information gap, jigsaw, problem-solving, and even interviews were interpreted as communication tasks (Brown 1994: 179; Mackey 1994: 67-68).

Pica claims that empirical linguistic data from jig-saw tasks is full of evidence supporting the fact that negotiation is indeed taking place in discourse between L2 learners and their interlocutors (1994: 508). Studies by Pica and her colleagues showed various structural modifications such as segmentation, relocation, and repetition made by the task participants (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989: 72; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell 1995: 22-28). This linguistic evidence supported the assumption that well-designed language learning tasks can provide learners with comprehensible input, output, and feedback which are necessary elements for a language learning environment.

Swain and her colleague were interested in learners' internalization of linguistic knowledge and found that dictogloss was an effective task for making students aware of language form and function (Kowal & Swain 1994). They used dictogloss in their research in the French immersion content-based instruction classroom to see whether this task would push the students into syntactic processing (Kowal & Swain 1994). While their report of their students making extended linguistic output was insightful, actual effectiveness of the dictogloss from the perspective of negotiation was not known well. This study, thus, focused on the interactions between language learners during the dictogloss task.

The dictogloss task

There is a four-stage procedure to use dictogloss in a classroom: preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis with correction (Wajnryb 1990: 7-9). In the first stage, students are prepared for the passage that they will be hearing through discussions of the topic and vocabulary. Then the teacher dictates the passage to the students. Students listen to the passage read to them at natural speed. They are encouraged to take notes of important words for reconstruction but not whole sentences. After the dictation stage, the students are arranged in pairs or small groups. They pool their notes

and produce their own written version of the text which should be grammatically accurate. During this stage, the teacher does not provide any language input. In the final stage, students' products are analyzed and corrected by the whole class.

The dictogloss is designed to draw the learners' attention to language form (Wajnryb 1990: 5-6). Wajnryb (1990: 19) claimed that the dictogloss promotes negotiation of meaning as well as negotiation of form. The interaction process in a small group during the task give students opportunities to talk about grammar in order to complete the task (Wajnryb 1990, Kowal & Swain 1994). The dictogloss is described as a contemporary approach to learning grammar; that is "language forms, structures, and patterns are treated from the perspective of their particular contextual meaning" in the task (Wajnryb 1990: 13). Thus, when the learners talk about grammar during the reconstruction stage, they talk about the predetermined context of that grammar point as well. Kowal and Swain (1994) valued this grammar-orientation feature of the task. They consider the collaborative reconstruction stage beneficial because the learners engage in metalinguistic discussion.

However, the dictogloss is not the same as a jig-saw task. The dictogloss is a task in which students needed to communicate about grammar, while in the jig-saw, students communicate in a content area of interest to them, but not about grammar per se (Pica 1995: 388). Although the interaction stage of the dictogloss was assumed to be an effective language learning environment (Kowal & Swain 1994), it was not clear whether negotiation which happened during the dictogloss interaction stage had the characteristics similar to the ones found in the jig-saw, whose discussion content was not grammar. Because of the grammar-orientation of the dictogloss, the nature of the negotiation in the task might be different from the negotiation in the jig-saw.

This study, thus, focuses on the learners' interactions within the reconstruction stage of the dictogloss task. The questions which guided the research are:

1. Does the dictogloss as a whole promote learner discussions of meaning, of form, or of both?

2. In what way(s) is the learner-learner negotiation, namely the nature of input, output, and feedback, in the dictogloss reconstruction stage, similar to or different from negotiation in jig-saw tasks?

Methodology

Subjects:

The subjects in this study were four adult ESL students who volunteered for this study. Two are Polish speakers and the other two are speakers of Chinese languages. They are female students studying in an inten-

sive English program in a university in Philadelphia. They were enrolled in classes of higher intermediate proficiency level. Their average length of stay in the United States was about one year at the time of the study.

Procedure:

In order to investigate learners' interaction patterns in the interaction phase of the dictogloss task, this study was carried out in an experimental environment. The students worked on the dictogloss task twice outside of their regular classes. On the first meeting, the students were given a training session in which the procedure of the task was explained. Then the students worked on the task. They were paired according to their first language, which made the Polish-speaker pair and the Chinese language speaker pair. The second meeting was held four days after the initial meeting. Assuming that the subjects had completely understood how to do the task, there was no briefing of the procedure at this time. The students were put into mixed language pairs, which created two Polish-Chinese dyads.

The procedure of the task activities followed the instructions given by Wajnryb (1990: 7-9) as much as possible. First, a native speaker instructor led a whole-group discussion about the topic of the story that the students were going to listen to. She then confirmed that the students understood some important vocabulary which would be helpful for them to understand the forthcoming dictation. The instructor explained the definition of the words and phrases and sometime wrote them on the board. The board was erased when the actual tape-listening started so that the listening part of the task would be reasonably challenging.

After this preparation, the students listened to a taped story text read to them at natural speed. The text was read three times with pauses between sentences. There were longer pauses between the readings. While they listened to the tape, the students wrote down words and phrases that they heard on the paper. After the third hearing, the students were put into pairs and asked to reconstruct the text. Each pair spent about 20 to 30 minutes on this activity. The students' activities during the reconstruction stage were audio- and video-taped.

During the reconstruction of the text, the pair could look at each other's notes. At the completion of the task, each pair had to write a reconstructed passage; thus, one of learners in each pair functioned as a scribe. It was emphasized that the passages they produce should not be an exact replica of the original passage but that their products should contain the same information as the original text, and that they should be grammatically accurate. The final stage of the task suggested by Wajnryb (1990: 9), analysis and correction in the whole class, was deleted because of the time constraints. The analysis and correction was left to the students by giving them the copies of the original text and their reconstructed texts.

Materials:

The story text was adapted from the intermediate-activity chapter in *Grammar Dictation* by Wajnryb (1990: 60-61). The focal structure was the past tense of verbs (See Appendix for the complete texts). The text was approximately 100 to 150 words in length.

Data Analysis

All of the data from the three groups were transcribed. The Polish-Polish pair discussed the task in Polish in order to complete the task. Since the researcher does not understand their language, the whole data from this group was unfortunately disregarded from the consideration. The total length of discourse was approximately one and a half hours. For the purposes of coding the data, the categories, Critical Language-Related Episodes (CLREs) were adapted from Swain and Lapkin (1995: 378) and Kowal and Swain (1994). The CLRE was defined as an episode in which language was the focus of the discussion. A CLRE begins with the identification of a grammatical point to be discussed or a sentence or phrase which needed to be reconstructed and finishes once the discussion is completed. It is possible for one episode to be embedded within another. For instance, there were two CLREs when a student corrected her partner's vocabulary in the larger discourse in which they negotiated a verb tense. Not every utterance was considered as CLRE, either. Their discussions were not coded as CLRE unless they identified linguistic problems. As a result, 66% of the total utterance was treated as CLRE.

According to Kowal and Swain (1994), there are three major categories of CLRE: Meaning-based Episodes, Grammatical Episodes, and Orthographic Episodes. These categories were data-driven from the study by Kowal and Swain (1994). The meaning-based episodes are those to which the students' attentions are directed on the semantic components of the language, such as understanding the content of the story. The grammatical episodes must relate to both explicit and implicit discussion on morphosyntactic issues, and the orthographic episodes are those relating to writing styles.

The data was coded by the researcher twice with a one-month interval. Where there were discrepancies between the two coding, those episodes were excluded from consideration. The intra-rater reliability was .82. Furthermore, the language-related episodes were subcategorized. Some of the sub-categories were adapted from Kowal and Swain (1994) and others were dependent on this particular data set.

There are 12 sub-categories. The categories are listed below along with examples[1]:

1. The utterances written in Italics are texts which the students remembered from the listening or attempted to reconstruct. Underlined utterances are the key features for the categories.

1. Meaning-based Episodes

a) Confirming the meaning of the original text

D *The doctor managed to save his life.* Did he die?

C No

D Yes. He

C I think to save his life. Managed to save his life It didn't say he died or not.

D I don't know he died or not saved his life may be not die.

b) Considering lexical choices

D There's a word I . . . didn't catch. say, they sent

C Raced . . . /rei t/ to hospital, I think.

D /rei t/ rushed... *rushed*

c) Vocabulary correction

D *check the phone*

C No No *He was chatting on the phone.* He was talk talking.

d) Reconstruction of the sentence using their own words

B *quick thinking.* something else?

C Yeah. *to save his* uh

B *to save his brother's life*

C no I don't think his life. It's a . . . make something is very quick to reheal to heal.

2. Grammatical Episodes

a) Verb tense

C Mmm why don't we use the . . . *he was looking for*?
He was looking for. What do you think?
In that time time in that time he was . . . doing something. He was looking for another job to do

D odd jobs to do

b) Preposition

C *It is last day of school term of this term or this term or school term*

D *This term of school*

C *This term of school.* Yeah.

c) Derivation

B When he heart his brother

C scream . . . screaming of his brother

B his brother screamed

C you can say the screaming of her brother his brother

B the same. O.K.

d) Verb + preposition

D *round . . . around . . .* which one should we use?

C *turned round turned it to*

D I think I use *himself* here

C *turned it round himself, turned it to himself* we don't need to use the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

exact same word.

e) Conjunction

C *due to* without *due to* Not *due to Because* is better.

D It's same meaning

C It's same meaning no. Sometimes it doesn't same meaning.

f) Pronoun

D Yes, I don't have to use *himself* here again.

C *Turned it to* himself. *Turned it to* himself. Right?

D Yeah, I know. I write down to himself again.

C Uh, *turned it to* uh, *turned it to*

D ###

C Because ...

D *turn*... is it *turn*?

C *Turn round. . . Turn back. . . Turn to. . . turned to*

D O.K. *turned it to himself*, it's self.

3. Orthographic Episodes

a) Spelling

B hurt? H-E-A-R- hurt? no hurt

C H

B H-U-R-T

b) Punctuation

C There is no period I think

B That's a that's a no no sentence

Results and Discussion

In total, 43 CLREs were identified. The results from the analysis of the group work are shown in Table 1. About the half of the episodes, 21 out of 43, were grammar-related episodes, and 15 out of 43 were meaning-based episodes.

The grammar-related episodes had the most variations. There were six different subcategories including the grammar point on which the original passage focused (.i.e. verb tense). While the main grammar point received attention (9 times out of 21), there were five other grammatical categories focused on by the students.

Among meaning-based episodes, the ones in which learners confirmed the meaning of the original passage were observed most frequently. They were followed by episodes for lexical search. There were also six episodes in which students discussed spelling.

Research question 1. Does the dictogloss as a whole promote learner discussions of meaning, of form, or of both?

The description of CLREs indicates that the task facilitates discussions of both meaning and form. As described in Table 1, 35% of the CLREs were

Table 1
Description of Critical Language Related Episodes (Group). n=43

Meaning-based Episodes		Grammatical Episodes		Orthographic Episodes	
Confirming the meaning of the original text	6	Verb (Tense)	9	Spelling	6
Lexical search	5	Preposition	4	Punctuation	1
Vocabulary correction	2	Derivation	3		
Reconstruction with own words	2	Verb + Preposition	2		
		Conjunctions	2		
		Pronoun	1		
TOTALS					
35%	15	49%	21	16%	7

meaning-based discussions. However, there were meaning-based discussions, but which were not necessarily language-related. For instance, the following dialogue is an example of students' negotiation in which they focused on meaning without identifying language problems.

Example 1:

D When . . . When he at this time . . . Timmy wandered in
C You should say his father to pick up the phone first. Then the Timmy
D oh yes.

In Example 1, the students focused on the sequence of events and negotiated meaning that is Timmy's "father picked up the phone" before "Timmy wandered in." However, the students did not identify any linguistic and structural problems relating to the sequence of the events. Thus, this example and other similar episodes to this were not included in the CLRE. Example 1 is an evidence that there were more occasions in which students focused and negotiated meaning. Therefore, the dictogloss as a whole seems to promote discussion of meaning.

As Kowal and Swain (1994) discuss in their study, the dictogloss indeed elicits discussion on form. The students engaged in discussions in which they needed to talk more or less explicitly about how English worked. In the study, the students focused on the grammar point for which the original texts were designed; 9 out of 21 occasions (42%) of grammar-oriented discussion was about the tense of verbs, and there were five other

grammatical points discussed in the sessions (12 episodes, 28% of all episodes). The students seemed to predictably focus on these features which were not the major focus of the original texts because they became aware of the gap between what they wanted to say or write and what they could actually say or write. Some of their discussions even reveal their metalinguistic cognition of their thinking processes as in Episode 1:

Episode 1:

225 C *Timmy . . . was wandering*. Right?
226 D *Timmy*
227 C Do you use progressive?
228 D Progressive
229 C Uh, I think we should use passive. Was wandering.
230 D Do you wander wander in? Simple past tense?
231 C Here is the simple past.

Although the linguistic terms they used in Episode 1 are not correct, their awareness of the gap in terms of their understanding of certain areas of syntax is observable.

In Episode 2, the students attempted to use the stem of a verb they managed to hear.

Episode 2:

80 A *when he heard . . . screaming*
81 or *he screamed*?
82 D *When he heard . . . his brother screaming*?
83 A Yeah
84 D *screamed* or *ing*?
85 A *ing*? yes *ing*

In line 80 and 81, Student A suggested two possible forms of the verb, **scream**. Her identification of problem was acknowledged by her partner in lines 82 and 84. Finally, Student A makes a decision that the verb should be "screaming" in the context. Although the students did not use sophisticated grammatical terms or metalinguistic explanations, they were aware of the morphology of the verb, and chose the right form.

Research question 2. In what way(s) is the learner-learner negotiation, namely the nature of input, output, and feedback, in the dictogloss interaction stage similar to or different from negotiation in the jig-saw task?

The negotiation during the reconstruction stage of the dictogloss did not seem to be similar to the one in a jig-saw puzzle. The role of input in this task actually appeared to be different; their access to original passage is limited. At the beginning, the students are given the original text aurally

without any negotiation opportunities. Once they are engaged in reconstruction, they do not have further opportunities to hear the original text. When the students are given an opportunity to negotiate and produce comprehensible input and output in regard to the content, they do not have access to the complete original passage, which is either on tape or in the hand of instructor. Thus, they have to depend on the limited input data, which are the notes, their memory, and their partner.

This circumstance limited the development of the negotiation. For example, in Episode 3 students' discussion the preposition was abandoned.

Episode 3:

141	C	*Stayed at home with. . .*
142		Uh...
143	D	What do you say? *with cold*? what did you hear?
144	C	*stayed home* that's it, we don't, if we don't understand

In Episode 3, students C and D became aware that they did not understand the message of the original text, "Timmy stayed home with cold." When they came to the point when they actually needed to make a decision and write down the passage, they chose to abandon the phrase. Since the dictogloss procedure does not require students to dictate the exact words and phrases from the original text, they could excuse themselves and abandon the uncertain phrase. While the students negotiated the meaning, their discussion on form was limited because they did not have sufficient input data or further access to the original text.

On the other hand, when one of the partners had a clear understanding of the original message, their discourse developed into negotiation. Episode 4 is a Meaning-based Episode, in which Student D repeats the original message with modifications and helps Student C understand the content.

Episode 4:

76	C	But last sentence, I didn't
77	D	Uh, *it's simply an accident. One of those things.*
78		*One chance in ten million.*
79	C	What does it?
80		One chance to win? the one million? Why?
81	D	It's an accident.
82	C	It's accident to win.
83	D	Not win.
84	C	To lose I think. But I heard...is win...the ten million
85	D	I think nothing win or lose.
86	C	Uh, ... is ... what?

87 D just said this kind of accident is one chance in ten million
88 C O.K.....O.K.
89 (C/D laugh)
90 C It's one chance. oh, ONE chance.
91 I think is WIN the chance to.
92 D no win no
93 C So I wonder why
94 D I . . . I thought it's *chance* but I'm not sure.
95 C It's *one chance out of ten million.*
96 C uh-ha

Unlike the purely meaning-based episodes such as in Example, Student C identified her problem: "one chance to win" (line 80).

Indeed, the initial comprehension of the original text by the students appears to have a significant impact on their interaction. The differences between the students abandoning the identified linguistic problem or continuing the negotiation depended on the degree of their understanding of the first input of the original text. The students seemed to realize that they could not reconstruct the story or talk about grammar without understanding the content of the original message. Student C's comment in Episode 3 (line 144), for example, indicates that they could not help abandoning the phrase "with cold" because they could not completely comprehend the original sentence.

Furthermore, there were also 6 CLREs in which students attempted to confirm the meaning of the original text. This is 40% of the Meaning-Based Episodes and 14% of all the CLREs. There was a pattern of strategies observed through the interaction. The students approached a challenging text with semantic processing first and then with syntactic processing. Episode 5 and 6 are from the interaction between student C and D. Episode 5 occurred when the task proceeded for about two minutes, and Episode 6 happened twenty minutes after they worked on the task.

Episode 5:

39 D And *he . . . he*
40 C *he . . .* uh. *When the telephone ring,* an . . .*telephone is*
41 *ringing, and he*
42 D *he take. he...*
43 no. *He take out he old gun to clean when telephone ring.*
44 C Yeah. *He stop to to he stop to . . .* uh *he stop to clean old gun*
45 *when the telephone ring*
46 D Yeah.

Episode 6:

197 C Uh, ah, yes. *When the telephone is ring.*
198 Here should be the past tense. Here is should be the pre-, uh

199		what do you say? *He was taking his old gun out*
200		*when the telephone rang*. Right?
201		Here is the *ing* and here uh, is
202	D	uh, I know he didn't use the progressing tense
203	C	Progressing tense...yeah, I agree to use...
204	D	yeah
205	C	...but I think in the later sentence, use the progressing.
206		The first use the past tense. You reverse...
		Reverse this.

Earlier in their reconstruction process, students C and D confirmed the sequence of events (Episode 5); later they were ready to engage in an extended "talk about grammar" (Episode 6).

In regard to feedback, this study indicates that there seems to be a need for students to receive some feedback on their product in order to learn. As we have seen earlier, the students redefined their focus on grammar rather arbitrarily. They were not always correct in solving the difficulties they identified. There were some occasions when the students abandoned the issue because of their limited comprehension of the original text and/or linguistic knowledge. Moreover, they did not identify all problems and mistakes. These phenomena were observed in Kowal and Swain's (1994) studies as well.

The "identification of problems" will theoretically raise students' awareness; the time when they noticed their problems would be a desirable chance to learn the particular linguistic feature they identified as a problem. Because of the design of the study, the subjects in the current study did not receive explicit feedback on their reconstructed text or on their hypotheses of how the language works.

For example, Student C was preoccupied with progressive forms throughout the tasks. Indeed, 8 of 9 CLREs regarding verb tense had her involvement. Her attention to the verb-form especially progressive forms seems very high. However, she could not explain why she should or should not use the forms in the questioned sentences during the tasks. Neither could her partner explain the use of progressive forms. The problems were often solved by either Student C or her partner's compromise rather than by their mutual understanding. Their learning for "filling the gap", thus, will depend on the inductive reflection of their experience of language use and the meaning of the message.

Corrective feedback, in fact, seems to be essential for the successful use of the dictogloss task. This fact is actually discussed by Wajnryb (1990: 11). She treats analysis and correction of the reconstructed text as a final stage of the task; the correction stage is as valuable as the interaction stage in her view (Wajnryb 1990: 8-9). Kowal and Swain (1994b) also mention the need for feedback. They note that all mistakes in the students' final texts were given feedback either in the follow-up whole-group discussion or the teachers' correction on their work.

In addition to feedback, proper preparation for better comprehension of the text is also desirable. In Kowal and Swain's (1994) study, the students were exposed to the theme and content of *L'environnement* in the content classroom before they worked on a dictogloss task with a text of this theme. The students had held discussions around the theme, read passage as well as completed comprehension activities and extended written activities prior to the task (Kowal & Swain 1994: 10). The topical warm-up discussion and vocabulary preview before the task probably need to be thorough, especially for lower level students, so that they are receptive enough to the listening stage.

Conclusions

Apparently, the interaction stage in the dictogloss differs from the jig-saw whose content is not grammar. The dictogloss task requires students to engage in more language-form related processes than the jig-saw does. While interaction in the jig-saw requires only meaning-based communication, in the dictogloss both meaning-based and grammar-based communication is expected. Pica and her colleagues evaluated the communication tasks according to the nature of negotiation within the task. They valued the tasks which provide language learners with the context filled with meaningful communication opportunities (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989: 83-84; Pica, Kanagy & Falodun 1993: 29-31). The jig-saw indeed provides students with the constant opportunities to be exposed to input, feedback, and output. Although they are implicit and embedded in the discourse, modifications made in discourse during the task are rich resources for language learning.

Students engaged in the dictogloss seem to be exposed to different amount of input, output, and feedback according to the different stages of the task. While the task as a whole promotes learners' discussions of both meaning and form, the limited access to the input and feedback in the reconstruction stage seems to affect the students' production. This stage in the dictogloss is useful and valuable to make the task communicative and to provide students with opportunities to hypothesize how grammar works. However, without proper preparation for assisting their comprehension of the original text, the outcome of students' interaction and negotiation may be restricted. Moreover, students still need adequate feedback from the instructor on their production since they are not always accurate in their grammatical knowledge. The result of this study suggested that the dictogloss completes as a context of language learning when the entire stages are proceeded.

References

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 305-325.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1985). Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness, 3,* 73-93.

Mackey, A. (1994). Targeting morpho-syntax in children's ESL: An empirical study of the use of interactive goal-based tasks. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 10* (1), 67-89.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, T. (1992). The textural outcomes of native speaker-non-native speaker negotiation: What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198-237). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Pica, T. (1994). Review article Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44,* 493-527.

Pica, T. (1995). Teaching language and teaching language learners: Expanding roles and expectations of language teachers in communicative, content- based classrooms. *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* (pp. 378-397). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11,* 63-90.

Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks in language teaching and research. In S. Gass & G. Crookes (Eds.), *Tasks and second language learning* (pp. 9-34). London: Multilingual Matters.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 737-758.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1995). What can second language learners learn from each other? Only their researcher knows for sure. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 11* (1), 1-36.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.). *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1994). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generated: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16,* 371-391.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Toshiyo Nabei, a native of Japan, has a M.S. Ed. in TESOL from the University of Pennsylvania. Her current research interest is SLA, especially the role of interaction in the learning process.

Appendix

Dictogloss Task Text

ONE IN TEN MILLION

On the last day of the school term, eleven-year-old Timmy stayed home with a cold. It was a rain day and his mother thought he'd better not go to school. His father, who was out of work, stayed at home too and looked for odd jobs to do. He was getting out his old gun to clean when the telephone rang. While his father was chatting on the phone, Timmy wandered in, picked up the gun, turned it around, pulled the trigger and shot himself. He was sent to the hospital; doctors managed to save his life. * The police did not charge anyone with any crime: it was simply an accident, one of those things, one chance in ten million. (Wajnryb 1990: 60) *This sentence was changed.)

YOUNG HERO

A nine-year-old boy dashed through flames to pull his younger brother to safety. The little boy had been playing with a cigarette lighter while sitting on his bike. The older boy said he was standing in the kitchen when he heard his brother screaming and ran to help him. He dragged the toddler to the bathroom and turned on the water to put out the fire. Doctors praised the young hero for his quick thinking and said the boy's burns would heal with time. (Wajnryb 1990: 61)

ESL and Parental Empowerment

Daryl Gordon

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

The impact of acculturation on immigrant and refugee families and on children's education has concerned many researchers. Some (Weinstein-Shr 1994; Smith-Hefner 1990) have examined literacy and educational achievement within the framework of the family and its pattern of acculturation. This research, conducted in an ESL class of Southeast Asian refugee parents, builds on this work, providing a description of the changes in parents' relationship to their children throughout the process of acculturation, focusing on the strategies these parents use to guide and assist their children in school. Finally, this paper draws implications regarding how the ESL class functions to empower parents in their interactions with their children's schools.

The impact of acculturation on families and its subsequent impact on the educational processes of children of immigrants and refugees is of concern to both educators and researchers. Within the growing literature on the impact of migration on Southeast Asian refugee families, some researchers (Caplan, Choy, and Whitmore 1985, 1989, 1991) have highlighted children's academic success against seemingly impossible odds. This research along with media stereotypes which have cast Asians as the "model minority" risks providing a collective image of all Asian groups as successfully acculturating to life in the U.S., with academically successful children who are achieving the immigrant American dream. This image, beyond being inaccurate, blurs crucial distinctions between Asians with very different immigrant/refugee status, class background, education level, and attitude toward U.S. culture. Lee (1994) and Nash (1991) indicate the problems involved when educators believe the model minority stereotype, have higher expectations of Asian students and may not, therefore, give adequate attention to academic or social problems among Asian students.

Within the Southeast Asian community, research (Caplan, Choy, and Whitmore 1991) highlighting children's remarkable academic success was conducted on refugees from the first and second waves of immigration during the 1970s, a group of refugees who were of middle class backgrounds, often had had some exposure to Western cultural values, and received sponsorship through churches and individuals in the U.S. (Lucas

1993). Research on the third wave of immigration, between 1980 and 1987, focuses on the largest wave of immigration and families from the poorest socioeconomic classes and mainly rural areas (Kelly 1986 as cited in Smith-Hefner 1990). This research tells of a much more complex and varied pattern of academic achievement and indicates the importance of understanding Southeast Asian refugees as different in terms of class and cultural background and time of arrival.

Peters' (1988) study of Southeast Asian youths in Philadelphia determined that Khmer and Lao parents come from the most rural background of the Southeast Asian refugees, and therefore have the least familiarity with Western culture, the lowest levels of education, and the most difficulty guiding their children through the American school system. A number of researchers (Baizerman, Hendricks 1988; Rumbaut, Ima 1988; Peters 1988; Lucas 1993; Welartna 1993) have indicated that Khmer families have experienced the greatest trauma due to the war and the following reign of Pol Pot. This has caused the highest incidence of post-traumatic stress disorders, affecting the education of both parents and children. Also, during the reign of Pol Pot, schools were banned and many teachers were executed or survived by masking their education and profession (Lucas 1993). Clearly, this has had a severe impact on the literacy and educational level of Khmer parents and children.

Rumbaut and Ima (1988) attest that Lao teens have the lowest GPA of all the Southeast Asian refugee groups. Studies of Lao teens in two different U.S. cities (Baizerman, Hendricks 1988; Peters 1988) indicate that they adopt a style of dress and speech which asserts their identity as different from their parents' and from a mainstream U.S. cultural orientation. Similar to Lee's (1994) finding regarding Southeast Asian students in a Philadelphia high school who identify as "new wavers", this group resisted parental authority and behaviors which encouraged academic achievement, indexing themselves as different from other Asian students and "more American... more cool." (Lee 1994: 423)

Some researchers have explored issues of acculturation of youths and their parents and the changing family structure in an attempt to explain varying levels of children's academic achievement. In particular, researchers (Buijs 1993; Trueba, Jacobs, Kirton 1990: Weinstein-Shr 1995) maintain that because children acculturate and learn the second language much more quickly than their parents, the generation gap between parents and children is complicated by cultural and linguistic gaps. Trueba, Jacobs, and Kirton (1990:67) indicate that while children often desire to assimilate and are embarrassed about parents' "old ways", parents fear children's loss of L1 and cultural values. In addition, roles of parent and child may become reversed as children often become the main translator (of both language and culture) for parents. This pattern is particularly problematic in Lao and Khmer families which retain traditional roles in which parents are the authority figures (Lucas 1993). Weinstein-Shr's (1994) research with fami-

lies in a Cambodian community in Western Massachusetts focuses on the negotiation of power as a crucial issue for parents in their changing roles in the U.S. Children's role as translator results in parents' reliance on children to decipher communication from the school. She also discusses parents' frustration at not being able to help children with homework and their fear of "looking stupid" in front of their children.

Parents' educational background, as well as cultural values, have an impact on parent involvement in their children's schooling. Smith-Hefner (1990) indicates that many Boston area teachers complain that Khmer parents are not involved in their children's education and do not attend parent-teacher conferences. She notes that communication between parents and non-Khmer educators is complicated by linguistic barriers and by parents' reluctance to question teachers' practices. This can be explained by the fact that in both Cambodia and Laos, the school is in complete control of a child's education. Parents do not question the teacher's methods, the curriculum, or school policies (Lucas 1993; Trueba, Jacobs, and Kirton 1990; Welartna 1993). Thus, in addition to linguistic and educational barriers to parent involvement in children's schooling, Lao and Khmer parents may feel that schools have both the right and the responsibility for children's education.

A number of educators and researchers have attempted to address the issue of lack of parental involvement in children's schooling. These initiatives have issued mainly from children's schools and adult education programs designed for parents. Hughes' (1993) review of childhood intervention programs indicates a prevailing attitude which assumes the deficiency of language minority parents and attempts to guide parents toward "middle-class Anglo-American" cultural parenting values. Auerbach (1990) similarly asserts that the prevailing model for family literacy programs is one of transmission which conceptualizes language minority parents as "literacy impoverished" and attempts to provide remedial support to language minority families in the form of school-like activities which parents can do with their children at home. She indicates that this method is inadequate and that family literacy programs must explore what literacy practices are naturally occurring in a home context. Epstein's (1986) survey of teachers' methods of including parents in school activities corroborates Auerbach's work. She indicates that parents reading to children is the most common technique teachers recommend for involving parents in children's schoolwork. Other activities were judged to be less "effective". Clearly, these activities are impossible for parents who do not have highly developed literacy levels in English.

Delgado-Gaitan (1994) asserts that academic research often limits its exploration of parental involvement strategies to mainstream cultural practices such as attendance at special school events. Her work illustrates the importance of exploring the cultural practices which language minority

parents employ to teach and guide their children through the U.S. school system. She perceives *consejos* or cultural narratives as a valuable way in which one Mexican immigrant mother participates in and encourages her children's school achievement despite lack of familiarity with U.S. schools. Delgado-Gaitan's research illustrates the importance of identifying and encouraging a range of culturally appropriate parental involvement strategies.

A growing collection of resource materials and curricula has begun to respond to this challenge through approaching parental involvement from a participatory approach. This approach highlights parents' strengths and encourages groups of parents to work together to locate culturally appropriate and feasible solutions to the issues which they identify as most important to their children's education. (Wallerstein 1983; Auerbach 1990; Nash et.al.1989; Refugee Women's Alliance 1992; Pecoraro and Phommasouvanh 1991).

In order for educators to promote effective parental involvement in the Southeast Asian community, there is a need to document the issues and problems parents perceive in their children's education and their responses to these problems. Much educational research in Southeast Asian communities has focused on children's achievement, while examining parents' attitudes and involvement as a minor factor of influence. Some researchers (Weinstein-Shr 1994; Smith-Hefner 1990) have adopted a more holistic approach, viewing literacy and educational achievement within the larger realm of the family and its pattern of acculturation. This paper continues in this latter tradition, attempting to provide a rich description of the family issues in the acculturation process in order to inform educators.

This paper documents participatory research with a group of Southeast Asian refugee parents who share concerns about their children's education and examines the changes in parents' relationship with their children throughout the process of acculturation, focusing on the strategies these parents use to guide and help their children in school despite linguistic and cultural barriers. Also, it examines how an ESL class in which family and education were central topics of discussion functioned to empower parents and to provide them with a range of involvement strategies. This work has important implications both for K-12 teachers concerned about involving Southeast Asian parents' in their children's schooling, as well as adult educators and family literacy practitioners concerned with understanding parents' cultural attitudes toward parenting and education in order to use these as topics of discussion in the classroom.

Methodology

The setting for this research is an ESL class funded through the Southeast Asian Action Council (SAAC), an umbrella organization representing five Mutual Assistance Associations serving the Cambodian, Ethnic Chi-

nese, Hmong, Laotian, and Vietnamese communities in Philadelphia. The class is taught by one native English speaking teacher and one Japanese/English bilingual teacher. The class meets five days a week at a location convenient to the Southeast Asian community in West Philadelphia. The teachers employ a student-centered, communicatively oriented approach in which the family is one the broad themes used as a topic for classroom discussion, reading, and writing.

All of the students are parents, most have school-age children, and many have expressed concern about their children's behavior and achievement in school. I was alerted to the importance of family issues when I began research in this classroom in September 1994. In an initial assessment interview, a Lao woman who had attended class for two years expressed great concern about her 15 year old son who had been arrested for using a weapon in a fight. She and other students often expressed their concerns about not being able to "control" their children in this new culture.

Although my weekly observations of this class began in the Fall of 1994, the focus of this paper is my research with this group during a four-month period from January through April of 1995. During this time I facilitated a Family-School Discussion Group which met for an hour each week. Employing a participatory approach, this group was designed to discuss issues of concern to students regarding parenting and their children's education. Some of the discussion topics included: differences in parenting practices in U.S. and native country; how children demonstrate respect in the different cultures; and issues involved with helping children with homework.

The participants included the eleven students registered for this class. All students are refugees, representing a variety of cultural backgrounds. Two students are ethnic Chinese from Cambodia, one is Lao, one is Vietnamese, and the remaining seven students are Cambodian. Three participants are men; eight are women. Students have lived in the U.S. anywhere from one to ten years, which places all students within the third wave of Southeast Asian refugees. Many students are on welfare and occasionally work under the table when they need to supplement their incomes. The participants' age range is from late 20s to mid 50s. Like many adult ESL classes, attendance in this class ranged from highly regular to infrequent, as influenced by work, family obligations, and illness. This research focuses on the six women who attended class most frequently and, thus, contributed the most information about family and educational issues in their families and communities. The English proficiency of this group ranges from beginning to low-intermediate and students' listening and speaking ability is generally more advanced than their literacy skills. Educational background in their native country is varied. Students' native literacy levels vary widely; while some students cannot decode in L1, others can read and write letters. Many students attended school in their home country from three to six years; some were unable to attend school in their

native countries because schooling was disrupted due to the war and ensuing political changes or because their families needed their help at home.

Data were collected through participant observation when I was facilitating the Family-School Discussion Group and non-participant observation when the classroom teacher was conducting class. My weekly interaction with this group as a facilitator allowed students to become familiar with me and to situate me in a culturally appropriate role of teacher, rather than the unfamiliar role of researcher. Also, my participation with the class as tutor and observer in the previous semester facilitated the group's knowledge of and comfort with me, allowing students to broach family issues which are topics of great personal significance. During my observation sessions, I took detailed field notes. I chose not to record sessions, because I felt this would inhibit participants' free discussion of sensitive topics. When time did not allow me to record an interaction in sufficient detail, I supplemented my notes by recall after the class session. When I was facilitating the class session, the classroom teacher, experienced in classroom research methods, took notes on the interaction. Again, I supplemented these notes by recalling additional issues immediately after each session. These data were supplemented by informal interviews with the two classroom teachers, individual interviews with five of the six participants who most frequently attended the discussion groups, participants' dialogue journals and other writings, an interview with the director of SAAC, and interviews with the Cambodian and Lao counseling assistants at a neighborhood school which many of the students' children attend.

Findings and Discussion

Weinstein-Shr (1994) examines power as one of the central issues for Khmer parents in their changing role in the U.S. Power and ability to control one's children is a recurring theme throughout all aspects of these data, as well. I examine how power is deeply related to changes occurring with refugee families and to parents' changing role within their families, as well as to their connection with children's schooling. These data illustrate the ways in which parents' authority is at issue in both positions, as well as the different strategies they use to regain authority as both parent and as educator. To explore the changes occurring in the SAAC families, I will discuss the cultural differences between U.S. and the native country, focusing on educational and familial issues; the changes families experience during acculturation; and parents' strategies for helping their children in school. Finally, I will examine the ways in which the ESL class functioned to empower parents in their roles of parent and educator.

Comparing Contexts: U.S. and Native Country

Before examining the specifics of how Lao and Cambodian families change through the process of acculturation, it's important to understand how these cultures and societies differ, particularly in their perception of education and the family. For example, parents spoke of a very different sense of community in the U.S. and native country. In an interview with Mrs. K., a Cambodian counseling assistant at a local elementary school, she noted that Cambodian communities demonstrated a more collective responsibility for children which she felt was influential in children's behavior:

> In my country, if you do something wrong, the whole community are watching you. And they gonna say something, they gonna pass word from one to another, but I don't think that's true here. (Mrs. K., 4/20/95)

Ms. C., the Lao counseling assistant, and Mrs. K. also spoke of the great differences between American and Cambodian and Lao schools. Like all the parents I spoke with, they mentioned that schools in their native countries were far stricter than in the U.S. and that corporal punishment was used to enforce school policy. The domain of school's discipline also extended beyond strictly academic matters. For example, Ms. C. recalls that teachers commonly checked that students' fingernails were not too long. Mrs. K. commented that Cambodian parents' relationship and expectation of school teachers differs greatly from the expectations of American parents. In Cambodia, parents rarely if ever see teachers because of great physical distance between home and school and the lack of telephones; Thus, they do not consult with teachers on educational matters. She said:

> In my country, most parents depend on send the school and depend totally on teachers. Teacher have to take care everything, discipline, everything. In here, we have to say, half and half. You cannot put everything in school. That's a problem. (Mrs. K, 4/20/95)

In seeming agreement with Mrs. K's point, a number of mothers mentioned that they told their children they should listen to the teacher as if she were their mother. Thus, although there is less communication between parents and schools in Cambodia and Laos, schools fulfilled some of the functions of discipline which families traditionally do.

Unlike the U.S. system, children in Laos and Cambodia are not required to attend school. In fact, children of poor families are often unable to attend school because they are needed to work the farm. School attendance, even at elementary school level, seems to be a status symbol; many parents remembered with pride the school uniforms they wore. One woman remarked that wearing the uniform, "you looked beautiful, different from people who don't go to school (B. 4/21/95)."

Literacy and education mean very different things for parents in their home countries and in the U.S. This difference is associated with a change from a rural to an urban environment and the changing social context of literacy for these families in the U.S. and in their home countries. Most parents understand literacy in the U.S. to have much greater significance in their children's present context than in their own context learning literacy in their home countries. In a discussion about the importance of education for children, one parent remarked on the different need for literacy in Cambodia when she was a child and her son's need for literacy in the U.S.:

> Me very old. A long time (ago), no problem. Son no old, many problem. No understand English, no job. In United States, no farmer — paper, pencil. My son talk back to me. I say you listen to me. Think again, everyday every year. In Cambodia no study, no problem. (O. 2/17/95)

The change of environment from a rural, farm-based economy in Cambodia to an urban economy in Philadelphia has changed the need for education, or as O. says, "paper and pencil". Thus, parents' attitude towards children's acquisition of literacy is changed, as well.

A discussion of changing context of family and education cannot be complete without referencing the severe disruption the war caused to this group's families and to their education. This cohort of parents were young children during the Vietnam War and the Pol Pot era and many spoke of the deaths of family members and of having witnessed brutal mass murders. The ability of these survivors to recover from this tragedy is nothing if not remarkable. In exploring the effect of this tragedy on family's acculturation process, one cannot ignore the role of the U.S. in the war. B. said that during the peak of the war, she and her family hid day and night in holes in the ground to escape the bombing. When she spoke of the terror of hearing the planes come, I remarked on the fact that it was American planes doing the bombing. Agreeing with me, she spoke of her anger at finding a book in the library that denied that bombing was occurring in Laos during this time. When I asked how she felt about coming to the U.S. after this, she replied:

B: I thought American is very bad country. Why America destroys my country? And my relative die, whole family with the bomb, the big bomb, right? Bomb the whole family dies, six people, seven people, no, gone, nothing, just like big hole and didn't see anybody. My relatives, aunt, uncle.

D: How old were you then?

B: 5, 6 years old.

D: So how did you feel about coming to the United States? B: I came here I think "I have to grow my childrens up, but I will live on welfare, I don't want to work. (laughs) I want to money from government and support my family, I thought like that. D: Because...

B: Because the government destroy my family. Many people think the same me Vietnamese, you know, Cambodian and Vietnamese. A lot the Vietnamese on welfare. (B., 4/21/95)

Although it's out of the scope of this paper to adequately explore the effect of resistance caused by the war toward U.S. policy and culture, this is clearly a salient, if infrequently discussed, factor to be considered in the adaptation and acculturation of Southeast Asian refugees.

Changes in the Family and influences on Education

In discussing how children and families had changed through acculturation, many parents commented that children did not listen to parents and that they did not take school work seriously. The comments of one parent are indicative of the responses many parents made regarding children in the two cultures:

> In Cambodia the children want to learn, it's not like in here. In Cambodia children want to go to school, but parents no money. The child is listen to mother and father not like in here. In here, when children get to be teenager, they don't want to listen. (C., 4/21/95)

All the parents I spoke with talked of authority problems between parents and teens within the Southeast Asian refugee community, particularly with teenage children. Although many of the parents in this study have younger children and don't have problems with them now, they told stories about relatives or neighbors who could not "control" their children. The problems they discussed included: frequently skipping school, having a boyfriend or girlfriend (a culturally proscribed behavior for Lao and Cambodian teens), gang activity (even among Cambodian and Lao children at the elementary school), dropping out of school, getting in trouble with the law, and running away from home.

In a discussion with Mrs. K. about these problems, she located their source in the acculturation process and the mismatch between U.S. and Cambodian culture:

> The kids they get American culture and at home, most parents they still carry Cambodian culture. And that is the problem. So when the kid was little, it's okay. Parent can control the kid. And when the kid come to school and been in school for a little time, like 4-5 years, they get more American culture. That's a problem. So, when the kid grow up, that's a problem. (Mrs. K., 4/21/95)

She also explained that children's greater knowledge about U.S. culture often allowed them to use this knowledge against parents to evade school activities. In a dramatic example, a Haitian girl in an ESL class planned to skip school through notifying her counselor and teacher that she would no longer be attending school because she and her family were returning to Haiti. Because she had more knowledge about the educational system and greater access to English, she was able to thwart her parents' knowledge of the situation. It wasn't until the ESL teacher called the parents because she was suspicious that the girl's plan was discovered (Personal communication 4/29/95).

In discussions about how their families have changed from their home countries to the U.S., two issues were central to the SAAC parents: how children demonstrate respect for parents and other elders and disciplining children. Participants often raised the topic of children's respect, or lack of respect, for parents through observations about language use. After reading a short play about a child who asked his mother for help on a homework assignment, one parent interpreted the child's questions and behavior as "angry." When I asked why, another participant responded, "In Cambodia, don't say, "You, you." When I again asked why, she responded, " Father have a lot of years. Talk to somebody older than you don't say you, you. Say sister, brother, uncle. Somebody, the same you, younger, say you. Not older." (C., 2/17/24) Thus, it seems to be inappropriate to address an elder by you, because it's viewed as disrespectful. In a later conversation, a both Lao and Cambodian parents mentioned their surprise and discomfort that English doesn't have more than one form of "you" to index varying degrees of respect.

Many parents also mentioned that children no longer greeted parents or elders properly. Both Cambodian and Lao parents discussed the importance of bowing one's head and making oneself lower than an elder; both groups also despaired that their children in the U.S. no longer respected those social norms. During a memorial service I attended at the home of a

Lao participant, all the adults evidenced traditional Lao social norms for this ceremony by taking off their shoes and lowering their heads as they entered the room. When the teenage daughter of one of the participants entered the room to borrow her mother's car keys, she observed neither of these norms, despite the fact that it was a sacred ceremony presided over by Buddhist monks (field notes 4/1/95). None of the adults expressed surprise or shock at her behavior. This incident illustrates the very different social norms of parents and children in this community.

Many parents discussed the differences in discipline practices in the U.S. and in their home countries, attributing children's lack of respect in the U.S. to parents' inability to employ traditional methods of discipline. Parents were well aware of the legal implications of hitting their children in the U.S. and this issue was raised frequently by participants. When the group struggled to define the term "child abuse", one parent put it very succinctly, "Somebody call police, I hit my kids." (L., 2/17/95) In a later conversation about how children demonstrate respect, the following conversation ensued between two Cambodian mothers:

> A.: Children not listen, hit in Cambodia. Here not hit, parents scare go to jailed. children not scared of parents in America. In America, some people are good, some people not good.
>
> M.: In my country, all the children listen to their parents.

A.'s first comment makes clear her perception that roles of parent and child are reversed in the U.S. A. believes that children should be scared of parents because this will make them behave well. However, in the U.S. instead of children fearing their parents, the parents fear the repercussions of hitting their children. M.'s comment illustrates her agreement with A.'s previous statement; when children fear their parents' corporal punishment, it makes them listen to their parents.

Mrs. K. concurred that corporal punishment is more routine in Cambodia and that parents often have difficulty finding other ways to punish children because "they only know one way" (Personal communication, 4/21/95). Children are well aware of the rules against physical abuse in the U.S. and the general mores against physical punishment in mainstream U.S. society. Mrs. K. mentioned the problems this clash of cultures can cause in the school, describing the way children can utilize this knowledge:

> The kid they understand that parent cannot hit the kid. So they understand the rule. When some parent hit the kid, they come to school report to the teacher. The teacher have to sent the nurse. The nurse have to report to DHS. The parents, they don't know what to do. They only know one way. (Mrs. K. 4/20/95)

Mrs. K. did not clarify the extent of the physical punishment in these cases. Clearly, if situations of physical abuse are occurring, the school and social workers have the responsibility to investigate these cases. The point, here, however, is the cultural clash between methods of parenting and the problems it raises for parents. If Cambodian parents believe that physical punishment highlights their authority as parents and teaches their children to respect that authority, as M. and A. above clearly do, the American cultural framework in which children can report parents for this practice seems strange indeed to these parents. For them, it represents another example of the reversal of roles and the withering authority they can exercise over their children.

B.'s attempt to employ more 'American' style discipline provides an example of the ways in which changing parenting styles can be problematic. T., the ESL class teacher, mentioned that B. frequently asked her questions about how American parents disciplined their children. B. often remarked that when she scolded or punished her children, they thwart her authority, telling her, "This is America. This is freedom. I don't have to do that" (Personal communication, 4/19/95). In an attempt to provide B. with information about discipline practices American parents use, T. gave her a copy of *Angry Feelings* , a book designed to be easily read by ESL or literacy students. From the description on the back cover, this book "explores such issues as building children's self-esteem, coping with stress and anger, and improving family communication" (Feagin 1990).

B. writes in her dialogue journal about the book:

> Angry Feelings - That is my favourite book because I learning how to keep self-control and what I should do to my children in the future. In the past my children did something wrong or they break something I always scream at the children or yelled at them. I did not have self-control. Now I know I am not good enough mother. Because I never read any book fore concerning about raising children. (Dialogue journal from 12/4/94)

Although T.'s intention was not to denigrate B.'s parenting practices, B. seems to have learned from the book that she is not a "good enough mother." T. notes that B. has attempted to radically change her method of discipline after reading the book, remarking, "*Angry Feelings* has become her Bible. She relies on it heavily and uses the information (which is only one kind of situation) as a way, literally, a path to follow in raising kids"

(Personal Communication, 4/19/95). T. remarks that when B.'s 7th grade son skipped school two days in a row, she didn't reprimand him initially because she was too angry. The following morning, she calmly discussed the situation with him, without giving him any punishment.

Strategies Parents used for Education/Discipline

In the wake of the educational and behavioral problems parents faced with their children, parents evidenced empathy, as well as frustration, with their vicious cycle of problems some of the children experienced in school. One parent said, "I think, 'They go to school. They don't understand. They feel bad, don't want to go to school. They have embarrassed for somebody inside the class." (L., 2/17/95) Another parent spoke of her teenage son's habit of skipping school, "Sometime he go to school if he want to go. Sometime he skip school or go late 9:00. He go to school only 2 or 3 times. I think he drop out of school. I talk a lot. I say, 'It's your future.' Why does U. do that? I think he feel embarrassed. He doesn't understand at all" (B., 2/17/95). Parents expressed concern about how to help children with their difficult schoolwork, when their children's English literacy was often well beyond their own and when they often had great difficulty communicating with their children's teachers.

B., the parent in this group who was most proficient in English literacy, was able to read with and to her younger children. She wrote about reading with her 9 year old son a book about Southeast Asian refugees which she had gotten from her ESL class; she felt it was important for him to know about Laotian history and to improve his reading.

> The New Arrival. This book very interesting for me and my son P., because they talk about my country in the past that made remine me too remember about my life in the past. When we read this book together my son H. has a lot of question too me especially a Dark night (part 6). He asked me what happen in the dark night? I say everybody they are come from Laos to Thailand. they're across the Mekhong river at the darknight because they're don't want to kill with soldiers. They are many people diet (died) at Mekhong River because its fast and wide. (B.'s dialogue journal — 2/6/1995)

Most parents did not have the proficiency in English literacy to be able to do this, however. B. mentioned that with her older children, she had a different strategy to ensure homework was completed, "I ask my son. How many homework — 2 or 3? I check to see if he do homework. I count." (B. 2/17/95) Other parents reported pairing their older children or relatives to help younger children complete their homework assignments.

Another participant mentioned that her husband tries to help their children with homework:

> Sometime my husband take my kids go to library.... My husband he don't read, he don't write, but my daughter a lot homework. Sometime my husband look homework, he don't know. Too hard. (S., 2/17/95)

Later, S. mentioned that her husband talked to school officials to secure a tutor for their daughter, "Sometime my husband take my kid go to library. But right now my husband call to teacher, my husband go to school my kid. My husband go to office, say to boss, my husband say want tutor help my kid." (S., 2/17/95) Other parents reported that their children went to community after-school programs, but many complained that there were too few tutors to help the children and that the atmosphere was often too noisy for children to complete their assignments.

In addition to ensuring that homework was completed, parents used a number of strategies to encourage their children's achievement in school. Similar to the mother in Delgado-Gaitan's study who uses *consejos* to guide and instruct her children, many parents mentioned talking to their children about the importance of doing well in school. When I asked one parent to tell me what she told her children about school, she replied:

> I say, "All children go to school. You study hard. You study very good English. You study good job. You have to go to work. You have make money a lot. You go to buy your house and buy cars. You drive the car by yourself." I say that, "You don't go to the place around on the sidewalk." I say that, but I don't know she (long pause). I forgot English word, but I say Cambodian to my children.... I say that everyday. When my children come back home, I say when they eat lunch, finish they do that homework.... But I don't know how to speak and how to understand in English all. But my children learning a lot of word than me and I don't understand." (L., 4/24/95)

This parent clearly views success in school as key to economic self-sufficiency and stresses to children both the financial rewards of doing well in school, as well as the hazards they must avoid, "the place around on the sidewalk", in order to succeed.

A few parents discussed their developing English proficiency as important in assisting them to monitor their children's progress and behavior in school. Two mothers reported contacting their children's teachers for the first time. One mother said:

> I am afraid to son skip school. When I tell to my son K., today you have the homework, K. said I have the homework but I do that at school. I think K. lies me. But I call to K. teacher. (O., 2/10/95)

Often the threat of calling the teacher is a hollow one, for both children and parents know that making contact in English is very difficult. Being able to contact the teacher in this instance indicates an important source of control and power for this parent, as she is finally able to determine whether her son is telling the truth.

Despite parents' difficulty in contacting teachers or other school officials, the teacher told me of a remarkable series of events in which L. had advocated for her children on a number of occasions (personal communication 4/29/95). In the first instance, L's son was being beaten up on the way to the annex classrooms in which the ESL classes were housed. L., concerned about her son's welfare, got him transferred to the main school building for ESL class. Later in the year, concerned about her son's skipping school, L. called the teacher and talked with her in English about this concern, as well as her concern that her son was missing three periods of mainstream instruction while in ESL class. In another incident, L. had a problem with her 2nd grade daughter who does not attend the neighborhood school, and is bussed to another location. When L. was called to pick her daughter up from school, she could not because she doesn't have a car and wasn't sure where the school was located. Concerned about this situation, L. contacted school officials and had her daughter transferred to the neighborhood school. These examples indicate the perseverance of this parent and her knowledge of the school system, as well as the importance of bilingual counseling assistants who were able to help this parent negotiate the school system to advocate for her children.

Perhaps the most dramatic strategy used by parents to enable their children to succeed is the increasingly common habit of sending adolescents out of the city to live with relatives if the teens are displaying discipline problems. Mrs. K. reported: "Many parents send their kids out of the city to relatives out of the city. With the Cambodian parents, there's about ten parents this year" (4/21/95). Out of a population of "a little over 100 Cambodian students" (from counselor's estimate), this represents about 10 % of children who have been sent away to live with relatives. The counselors both mentioned recommending this to parents when they encountered discipline problems, and in fact when B.'s son began to skip school and she asked the counselor for advice, she recommended either moving or sending the son out of the city. Although B. thought this was an unfeasible and rather dramatic solution, she herself has considered sending her sons to live with her parents in Laos.

Ramifications of the ESL class on Parents' Empowerment

This class functioned in various ways to empower parents, providing them with information about American culture and schools, and various resources and strategies to use in helping their children. Parents discussed issues and problems regarding parenting and education during the class, sharing information about options and resources such as the location of the local library and the availability and effectiveness of tutoring/homework programs. The increasing literacy and English proficiency of parents also seemed to aid their involvement with their children's education in many ways. Some parents were able to help their children with homework or read with them and a number of parents noted that children helped them with their homework or reading tasks. These interactions around literacy provided a resource to both parties, as well as a point of contact for parents and children who seemed to be located in two divergent cultures. Parents' greater proficiency with English also helped them to interact with officials at their children's school, enabling them to communicate directly with school officials to obtain accurate information about their children's progress.

Parent's participation in the ESL class also provided them with an opportunity to ask questions of the teachers about American traditions and behaviors which they did not understand. B. wrote in her dialogue journal about concerns she had about her teenage son:

> Last weekend I saw alot the boys and girls came to he room and they do still went to party at the school. in my country the girls never come to boy or men's room.

> T., can you explain to me in American ways why the teacher make party for the students? Why the girls come to boy's house? How are they doing in American traditional? Please answer my question. Sincerely, B. (Dialogue Journal 3/28/94)

B. uses this entry in her dialogue journal to inquire about her sons' behavior and the role of the school. Although B. is clear that in her culture this behavior is inappropriate, she asks T. about "American ways" in an effort to judge whether this behavior is similarly inappropriate by American parenting standards. In this way the teacher can act as a cultural resource, allowing B. greater access to information about American culture. This information is particularly important, as children often used their greater knowledge of American culture in order to thwart parents' authority.

In an activity designed to have the SAAC parents ask questions of other U.S. parents, the teacher initiated a project in which the SAAC class collectively wrote a letter to a native English speaking adult literacy class. Students were asked to brainstorm questions they might like to ask the American students, and groups of students worked to write and revise portions of the letter. Many of the SAAC class' questions for American students revolved around children's behavior and education:

> We have many question to talk to American students. 1. How do people in the United States discipline their teenagers when they don't listen to their parents? How do you help your children with their homework when they don't understand? How do you help your children if they drop out of school? How do you take care of teenagers go to school if they don't want to studies and often go outside at night?" (Final draft of letter - 2/22/95)

This activity represents a way in which this class used students' developing literacy skills to interact with other parents and to gain greater access and information about American parenting and educational practices.

Conclusion

These data demonstrate that within U.S. culture the SAAC parents experienced difficulty asserting their authority and power over children in many ways. Children were often able to exploit their greater knowledge of U.S. culture in order to thwart their parents' authority. Many parents felt that their authority was severely damaged through not being able to physically punish their children. The different framework of respect in the parent-child relationship in the U.S. also was perceived by parents to accord them less authority. Parents experienced difficulty with the schools, both in communicating with school officials, which was hampered by both linguistic and cultural barriers, and in parents' inability to assist children in their education through practices like helping them with their homework and reading.

Despite these problems, parents evidenced a variety of ways to participate in their children's education: through finding other individuals or groups to help their children with schoolwork; advising and guiding children; advocating for their children with the school; and by sending adolescents to live with relatives if parents felt they could not mediate their discipline problems.

The parents' ESL class provided an avenue for parents to discuss and locate solutions for the difficulties of parenting in U.S. culture. The class

provided a forum for participants to share problems and resources; to increase English proficiency, enhancing the connection between them and their children and their ability to communicate directly with school officials; and to use teachers as a cultural resource in understanding and navigating children through this new culture.

References

Auerbach, E. (1990). Making *meaning, making change*. Boston: University of Massachusetts.

Baizerman, M., & Hendricks, G. (1988). *A study of southeast Asian refugee youth in the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota. Final report.*

Buijs, G. (Ed.). (1991). *Migrant women:: crossing boundaries and changing identities*. Oxford, UK: Berg Publishers.

Caplan, N., Choy, M., & Whitmore, J. (1985). *Southeast Asian refugee self-sufficiency study*. Washington, DC: Office of Refugee Settlement, Department of Health and Human Services.

Caplan, N., Choy, M., & Whitmore, J. (1985). *The boat people and achievement in America: A study of economic and educational success*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Caplan, N., Choy, M., & Whitmore, J.. (1991). *Children of the boat people: A study of educational success*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Consejos : The Power of Cultural Narratives. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 25 (3), 298-316.

Epstein, J.. (1986). *Parent involvement: Implications for limited English proficient parents* Proceedings of Symposium on Issues of Parent Involvement and Literacy. Trinity College.

Feagin, C. (1990). *Angry feelings*. Chicago: Contemporary Books.

Hughes, M. (1993). *You must not spank your children in America: Hmong parenting values, corporal punishment, and early childhood intervention programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Northwest Anthropology Conference.

Lee, S. J. (1994). Behind the model-minority stereotype: Voices of high- and low-achieving Asian American students. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* , 25 (4), 413-429.

Lucas, A. (1993). *Cambodians in America: Courageous people from a troubled country*. San Francisco: San Francisco Study Center.

Nash, A. (1989). *Talking shop: A curriculum sourcebook for participatory adult ESL*. Boston: University of Massachusetts.

Nash, P. T. (1991). ESL and the myth of the model minority. In S. Benesch (Ed.), *ESL in America.: Myths and possibilities*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Pecoraro, Diane, & Phommasouvanh, B. (1991). *Limited English proficient parent involvement project*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota State Dept. of Education.

Peters, H. (1988). *A study of Southeast Asian youth in Philadelphia: A final report*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

Refugee Women's Alliance. (1992). *Family talk time: A curriculum for refugee and immigrant parents*. Seattle, WA: Refugee Women's Alliance.

Rumbaut, R. G., & Ima, K. (1988). *The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study. Final report to the Office of Resettlement.*

97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sandoval, M. (1986). *Title VII projects of academic excellence: Efforts to promote parent involvement and literacy.* Proceedings of Symposium on Issues of Parent Involvement and Literacy. Trinity College.

Smith-Hefner, N. (1990). Language and identity in the education of Boston-area Khmer. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 21*, 250-268.

Trueba, H., Jacobs, L., & Kirton, E. (1990). *Cultural conflict and adaptation: The case of Hmong children in American society.* New York: Falmer Press.

Wallerstein, N. (1983). *Language and culture in conflict: Problem-posing in the ESL classroom.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1994). Literacy and second language learners: A family agenda. In D.Spencer (Ed.) *Adult Biliteracy in the U.S.* McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Welartna, Usha. (1993). *Beyond the killing fields: Voices of nine Cambodian survivors in America.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Daryl Gordon is a doctoral student in Educational Linguistics in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interests include issues related to identity and acculturation.

Information for Our Contributors:

The purpose of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)* is to present works in progress by students and professors on topics ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition. Papers included in *WPEL* are generally based on research carried out for courses offered in the Language in Education Division of the Graduate School of Education.

It is our intention that *WPEL* will continue to be a forum for the exchange of ideas among scholars in the field of educational linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and at universities with similar programs in educational and applied linguistics around the world. *WPEL* is sent to nearly one hundred universities world-wide.

WPEL is published each Fall and Spring. The regular subscription price is US$ 4.00 per issue. Academic departments are invited to arrange an exchange subscription by sending the editors of this journal one copy of their working papers (or similar publication) in exchange for each requested copy of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*.

1.Submissions to *WPEL* cannot be under consideration for publication elsewhere unless permission has been granted by the other publications. In this case, it is the author's responsibility to obtain the necessary permission and citation. We ask that any *WPEL* article published elsewhere at a later time include a reference to *WPEL*. The individual authors retain copyright privileges.

2.Submissions must conform to APA format and must include an abstract of no more than 125 words.The methods section of any submission must be sufficiently detailed so that it could guide the replication of a similar study.Editors make every effort possible to ensure the accuracy of all citations; however, the final responsibility for citations remains with the author of each article.

3.Articles not accepted for the current issue may be rewritten and resubmitted for the following edition. A recommendation to rewrite is not a guarantee of future publication in *WPEL*.*WPEL* is not responsible for returning articles that have been sent to our office. Please, do not send an original paper, and do not send articles on diskette.

4.This journal recognizes the difficulty in using gender-neutral language. However, we are committed to avoiding the clumsy he/she construction and the use of plural pronouns for the singular antecedent. Therefore, we encourage authors to find their own solutions within these guidelines.

All correspondence should be addressed to:
Working Papers in Educational Linguistics
Language in Education Division A-12,
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut St.
Philadelphia, PA. 19104

Telephone: 215.898.3288
Fax: 215.573.2109
Email: wpel@nwfs.gse.upenn.edu
Internet: http://www.upenn.edu/gse

EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS
READING/WRITING/LITERACY
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION
TESOL

Courses:

Sociolinguistics

TESOL Methodology

Structure of English

Educational Linguistics

Second Language Acquisition

Language Diversity in Education

Multicultural Issues in Education

Classroom Discourse and Interaction

Language Planning and Language Policy

Social and Historical Perspectives on Literacy

Teaching Reading to Second Language Learners

Forming and Reforming the Reading and Language Arts Curriculum

For detailed program information, please write:

Admissions Office
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216

Internet: http://www.upenn.edu/gse

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics

Volume 12, Number 1 Spring 1996

Articles in this issue

Teresa Pica
Second Language Learning Through Interaction: Multiple Perspectives
1

Mitsuo Kubota
Acquaintance or Fiancee: Pragmatic Differences in Requests between Japanese and Americans
23

Manka Varghese & Kristrine Billmyer
Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion Tests
39

Toshiyo Nabei
Dictogloss: Is it an Effective Language Learning Task?
59

Daryl Gordon
ESL and Parental Empowerment
75